



## THE EVOLUTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION.

By H. V. LANCHESTER [F.].

Read before the Royal Institute of British Architects, Monday, 17th May 1915.

THE subject of my Paper has such an important bearing on the practice of the art of architecture, that a sketch of the gradual development of the method by which competitions are conducted will possess an interest to many, not so much for its own technicalities as for the possibilities it affords for the advancement of an art which we may take a just pride in practising. Though there be some among us who feel a doubt as to the beneficial influence of the competition on design, I trust that by a closer study of the question, such as I shall advocate this evening, these doubts may be dispelled. It is not, however, my purpose to deal at length with the proposition as to whether, either under existing or under ideal conditions, the best architectural standard would be reached by means of competitions or otherwise, but rather to devote myself to the history of the competition, leading up from the first rudimentary efforts in this line to those of our own day which exhibit the most systematic organisation. This review, supplemented by a few remarks on the special advantages and difficulties the architectural competition presents, will, I imagine, enable each to form his own opinion as to how far the merits of the competitive method advance the art we practise, and how far its demerits are inherent or are merely the result of defects in procedure. It would be idle for me to pretend that my own views are not decided and definite, but it will be my endeavour to let the facts speak for themselves, so that deductions rather than dogmas lead to the conclusions you may arrive at.

I will briefly sketch the competitive activities recorded in architectural annals.

I have found no definite record of an architectural competition in Greece or Rome, but the principle was one so familiar to these peoples that I should be greatly surprised if none such took place. For example, the four sculptors, Leochares, Bryaxes, Scopas, and Praxiteles, were employed to decorate each of the four façades of the Mausoleum, and the public were thus able to compare their work (Vitruvius). The public competitions in other arts are well known to you, but I cannot forbear quoting from the Introduction to Book 7 of Vitruvius an account of one of these :—

"The Attalic kings, stimulated by their great love for philology, having established an excellent public library at Pergamus, Ptolemy, actuated by zeal and great desire for the furtherance of learning, collected with no less care a similar one for the same purpose at Alexandria, about the same period. When by dint of great labour he had completed it, he was not satisfied, unless, like the seed of earth, it was to go on increasing. He therefore instituted games to the Muses and Apollo, and in imitation of those in which wrestlers contended, he decreed rewards and honours to the victorious in literature. These being established, when the time of the games arrived, learned judges were to be selected for the decisions. The king having chosen six, and not readily finding a seventh, applied to those persons who had the care of the library, to ascertain whether they knew anyone fit for the purpose. They told him that there was a certain man named Aristophanes, who with great labour and application was day after day reading through the books in the library.

At the celebration of the games, Aristophanes was summoned and took his seat among those allotted for the judges. The first that contended were the poets, who recited their compositions, and the people unanimously signified to the judges the piece which they preferred. When the judges were required to decide, six of them agreed to award the first prize to him who had most pleased the multitude, and the second prize to some other candidate. The opinion of Aristophanes being required, he observed that the best poet had pleased the people the least. The king and the whole multitude expressed their great indignation at this opinion, but he rose and besought that they would allow him to speak. Silence being obtained, he told them that one only of the competitors was a poet, that the others had recited other men's compositions, and that the judges ought not to decide upon thefts but upon compositions. The people were astonished, and the king in doubt; but Aristophanes relying on his memory, quoted a vast number of books on certain shelves in the library, and comparing them with what had been recited, made the writers confess that they had stolen from them. The king then ordered them to be proceeded against for the theft, and after their condemnation dismissed them with ignominy. Aristophanes, however, was honoured with great rewards, and appointed librarian."

The various morals to be deduced from this story I leave to your imagination.

In Leader Scott's work on the Comacine Guilds, we find that mediæval competitions arose under rather favourable circumstances, as the members of the Guild were naturally accepted as qualified to adjudicate. In the case of Siena Cathedral a council of monks, with masters of the Guild, met to consult on the placing of the columns in the second foundation, and

"Also, on 17th July, 1357, to choose between two designs of columns and a chapel made by Francesco Talenti and Orcagna, when each candidate elected two Masters as arbiters. Francesco Talenti chose Ambrogio Lenzi, a Lombard, and Frate Filippo Riniero of S. Croce. Andrea Orcagna chose Niccolò di Beltramo, also a Lombard, and Francesco di Neri. These could not decide, and Piero di Migliore the goldsmith was taken as umpire, the parties binding themselves to abide by his decision. Giovanni di Lapo Ghino and Francesco Talenti were ordered to make new designs. At length, on 28th July, Orcagna's plan was chosen."

Unfortunately these Guilds did not contrive to keep abreast of the times, and when we come to the competition for the dome of the Cathedral at Florence, we find that Brunellesco, who ultimately proved to be the ablest architect, was outside the brotherhood. Quoting again from Leader Scott, we find that

"The *Opera*, on 19th August, 1418, announced a competition. Any artist whatsoever who had made a model of the projected cupola was to produce it before the end of September, the model accepted to have a prize of 200 gold florins. The date of decision was prolonged to October, and then to December, when a number of models were sent in, the competitors being Magister Giovanni di Ambrogio, C.M. of the *laborerium*, Manno di Benincasa, Matteo di Leonardo, Vito da Pisa, Lorenzo Ghiberti, all *Magistri* of the Masonic Guild; Piero d'Antonio, nicknamed Fannulla (do nothing), Piero di Santa Maria in Monte, masters in wood. There were several models by members of the civic company, the *Arte dei Scarpellini* (stone-cutters); and last, not least, a model in brick and mortar without scaffolding, made by Brunellesco, Donatello, and Nanni di Banco. This last won the prize, but the *Arte dei Maestri* had not evidently faith enough in one outside their ranks to commence at once with the building."

The story of Brunellesco's restiveness at his old rival Ghiberti being associated with him in carrying out a design peculiarly his own, and how he tried to throw scorn on him by locking up his plans and feigning illness, thus leaving Ghiberti to work in the dark, is too well known to need repetition. Brunellesco's strike for independence appears to have given the death-blow to the great Masonic Guild, which, as it became more unwieldy, had been slowly disintegrating. Although he was matriculated into the Guild, it appears to have been against his will, as he ignored his membership, and was imprisoned for not paying his fees. Thus the Guild drops out as a body controlling competitions, and for a long period such decisions as are made come ostensibly from the laymen interested, or, in modern terms, the promoters.

Though numerous designs were prepared for St. Peter's at Rome, and though some of these were still under consideration when another was demanded, the circumstances hardly justify us in regarding them as competitive. We come nearer to the idea of a competition in the case of the Louvre, where at one stage a selection could have been made from a number of designs. Mr. W. H. Ward, in his *Architecture of the Renaissance in France*, has a description of the competition for the completion of the Louvre from which I make the following extracts:

"A competition was held, and the criticisms of architects invited on the designs it produced. Among those who submitted schemes were François Mansart, Jean Marot, and Pierre Cottart. Another competitor was Claude Perrault, one of the most eminent savants of his time, distinguished for his works on mathematics and natural history, who had made a study of architecture, and was introduced to Colbert's notice by his own brother Charles, a confidential clerk in the minister's offices."

"Mansart might have been selected, but his refusal to make a final choice among the alternatives he had submitted at Colbert's request led to his rejection. The criticisms on the remainder proved inconclusive, and intrigues in favour of this or that competitor were rife. The King was too much taken up with Versailles to bestow much interest on the matter. Colbert in this dilemma sent the drawings to Poussin to obtain the opinion of the Roman Academy. They thus came under the eye of Bernini, who condemned them all."

"The Cavaliere Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680), then at the zenith of his fame, was the chief exponent of the barocco school, and was considered the first architectural authority in the world. It was decided to invite him to Paris to give his advice on the spot. Received in France with almost royal honours, such as never fell to the lot of an artist before or since, he soon produced a new scheme which he attributed to divine inspiration (1665). The foundation-stone was laid by the King with great pomp, but the design was not really approved by anyone in France, and it soon became evident that it would not be carried out. Bernini returned home the same year in high dudgeon, but royally paid, leaving the field clear for the Frenchmen. The King was induced to believe that he preferred a fresh design prepared by Claude Perrault; and this with minor alterations was carried out (1667-80), though the work remained under the charge of Le Vau, and later of d'Orbay."

"Such, briefly, was the course of events which led to the erection of the world-famed Colonnade of the Louvre. On the surface it is a series of personal rivalries and petty intrigues; and as so often happens in the world's history, a momentous decision, the outcome of deep underlying causes, is apparently the result of accident. Perrault's design represents French thought of that age with a fidelity which both those of his French rivals, so far as we know them, and that of Bernini, were equally far from attaining. It combines the grandiose spirit of the times, which in Bernini's design was clothed in a barocco dress, with the pure classical forms in which the Frenchmen had embodied their semi-mediaeval conceptions."

"About the tendencies of Bernini's scheme there is no doubt, and therein lies its chief, if not its only, merit. It proclaimed literally from the house-tops that it was a single building representing a single idea."

"Perrault's design owes much to Bernini—its colossal scale, its giant order, and the subordination of the ground storey into a stylobate, the long, flat line of balustrade and cornice, the simplicity of the mass, the unity of the conception. Neither did he altogether avoid the faults criticised in Bernini. His façade hardly corresponds more closely with what is behind it. But Perrault had a far better grasp of the problem before him: he realised that what he had to provide was a screen to an existing palace, which was to express not so much the actual arrangements of this palace as the majesty of the monarchy it symbolised."

In the eighteenth century we come to a better organised competitive proposal—namely, that for a monument to Louis XV., where the conditions were exceptionally open in their character.

To quote Patte's work published in 1767:

"It was on the 27th June 1748 that the Provost of the Merchants and Aldermen asked his Majesty's permission to raise, in such a position in his capital as he might be pleased to allocate, a testimony to the zeal, the love and the gratitude of his people. M. de Turneham, then his majesty's director of building, invited the architects of the Academy to prepare schemes for the site of such a monument in the quarter of Paris that appeared to the competitor the most suitable.

"Not only the Royal architects but also several other artists seized the opportunity to show their zeal and their talent. These artists chose the quarters that seemed best to accord with the beauties they had in mind, and, guided solely by their genius, evolved designs that would have done honour to the ablest architects of antiquity."

These schemes, however, involved great disturbance among important industrial and commercial interests, and the King having selected an open area between the Tuileries and the Champs-Élysées, a fresh competition was initiated. A site plan was issued accompanied by the single instruction that the King's statue should be on the line of the broad walk in front of the Tuileries garden. Several of the designs had special advantages, and M. Gabriel was directed to combine these, in order to include them all in the executed work. Thus was determined the design of the Place de Louis XV., now the Place de la Concorde.

In the eighteenth century the number of architects in the British Isles was not a large one, and competitions were usually limited to a few; but in 1768 James Gandon, Thomas Cooley, and Thomas Sandby, with over sixty other competitors, competed for the New Exchange, Dublin, which Cooley

secured. The competition for the East India Company's building in 1799 produced designs from Holland, Jupp, Dance the younger, and Soane. Slightly earlier, Thomas Harrison won the competition for rebuilding the Castle at Chester.

The fourth decade of the nineteenth century witnessed three important competitions. The first was that for the Houses of Parliament. Ninety-seven designs were submitted to four Commissioners, who on 29th February 1836 unanimously selected that by Charles Barry as the best. For St. George's Hall, Liverpool, there were eighty-six competitors, among whom H. L. Elmes was successful, subsequently winning the Assize Courts Competition in 1841. The two buildings were combined and carried out during the succeeding ten years. For further particulars I can refer you to Mr. A. E. Richardson's work on *Monumental Classic Architecture*, from which I have taken this note. The third was that for the Royal Exchange. Robert Smirke, Joseph Gwilt, and Philip Hardwick were the assessors. The first premium was awarded to William Grellier, the second to A. de Chateauneuf and Arthur Mee, and the third to Sydney Smirke. Designs by T. L. Donaldson, Richardson, and David Mocatta were commended, but were considered to exceed the stipulated cost of £150,000. As you know, none of these designs was carried out.

On the 30th September 1856, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings gave notice that they were prepared to receive three designs from architects of all countries—the first to comprise a scheme for the concentration of the principal Government offices on a site lying between Whitehall and the New Palace at Westminster; the other two, designs for buildings which it was determined to erect forthwith as parts of such scheme. One of these was to be a Foreign Office, the other a War Office. The paper of instructions to architects, 1628 copies of which were issued, gave the sizes of all, or most of, the rooms required.

The judges appointed to consider these designs were the Duke of Buccleuch (who was prevented from acting), Earl Stanhope, Viscount Eversley, Mr. William Stirling, M.P., Mr. I. K. Brunel (civil engineer), and Mr. William Burn (architect). The prizes to be awarded were three for the block plan, amounting together to £800; seven, amounting to £1,900, for the Foreign Office designs; and seven, amounting to the same sum, for the War Office designs. The judges awarded the prizes, the premiums were paid, but none of the premiated designs (which remained the property of the Office of Works) was executed.

The obvious defect in the inception of this group of competitions was the simultaneous issue of programmes for a general scheme, and for two buildings that would form part of this. We can hardly be surprised that it ended in a muddle, and left an impression adverse to the competition system. Even in 1880, when Mr. Thomas Porter read a Paper here on the subject, he referred at length to this competition in support of his objections to competitions generally, and at this time a large number of members of our Institute seem to have been in agreement with him.

In 1864 a competition was held for Museum Buildings on the site now occupied by the Natural History Museum. It was assessed by a jury composed of

Lord Elcho.	Messrs. Tite.	Fergusson.
	David Roberts.	Pennethorne.

Captain Fowke gained the first premium, Professor Kerr the second, and Mr. Cuthbert Brodrick the third. Complaints were made as to the drafting of the conditions, which divided the site into two equal halves, and left it very vague as to how far the western half could be used for the accommodation scheduled. This division was obviously unnecessary, and some of the designs, including that of Captain Fowke, ignored it. Those which did not were thus placed at a disadvantage.

The competition for the Law Courts in 1866 and 1867 was conducted by a Commission, with whose concurrence the following were appointed as judges:

Chief Justice Cockburn.	W. E. Gladstone.
Sir Roundell Palmer.	W. Stirling (Maxwell).
W. Cowper, First Commissioner of Works.	



In response to an application from the competitors, two professional men—John Shaw and George Pownall—were added. The judges took into consultation every interested party they could call to mind, asking for verdicts on the plans from each special point of view. As may be imagined, though the designs submitted were only ten in number, the affair got into a desperate tangle. As an example, a report on ninety-nine various points of detail based on the views of heads of departments and other authorities shows that every competitor scores somewhere. Edward Barry is an easy first, and G. E. Street near the bottom of the list. This might in itself be regarded as a sufficient proof of the futility of this method of analysis, but if a further one be needed an inspection of the mass of reports and investigations resulting, will more than suffice.

It is probable that there was never a more conscientious and painstaking jury, but the value of their work was neutralised by an almost complete ignorance of the technique of design. The professional members were evidently overweighted by the ideas of their distinguished *confrères*, and the ultimate results were so inconclusive and confused that everyone concerned must have been relieved when the great beauties of detail in Street's design were made clear, and a justification was found for awarding him the work.

The competition for the Paris Opera House took place in 1860 under the auspices of a jury composed as follows :

Count Walewski, <i>President</i> .		
MM. Caristie	MM. Le Bas	MM. Questel
Duban	Le Sueur	Lenormand
De Gisors	Lefuel	Constant Dufeux
Gilbert	De Cardaillac	Hittorff, <i>rapporteur</i> .

Five prizes were awarded : First, Jinain ; second, Crepinet and Botrel ; third, Garnaud ; 4th, Due ; and 5th, Garnier. No design was considered quite satisfactory, and a second competition between the premiated competitors was advised. As the result of this M. Garnier was in 1861 commissioned to carry out the building.

In 1882 an open competition for the construction of the Sorbonne was held. The jury consisted of

3	members representing the University of Public Instruction.
"	" " " " Municipal Council.
"	" " " " Prefecture of the Seine.
"	" " " " Professors of the Faculties.
6	" " elected by the competitors.

The site was an extensive one, bounded by streets on all sides, but near the centre of the west side stood the church, and adjoining it a courtyard, to which the following references were made in the programme : " The church, the character of which is left to the appreciation of the competitors, should be preserved." " It is desired that competitors should also preserve as far as possible the buildings surrounding the court, or at least, not materially alter the size and general appearance of the court."

M. H. P. Nénot won this competition with a brilliant design which I wish I could spare time to discuss in detail, but for those interested I may state that in the Library they will find both the original conditions of the competition and a monograph of the completed work.

The competition for the two palaces of the 1900 Exhibition at Paris took place in 1896. The jury numbered no fewer than 47 members. Five premiums were awarded in each case. Owing to the amount of work to be done in a short time the Grand Palais was entrusted to the architects placed first, second, and third, with M. Girault, who was placed fourth, as architect-in-chief. M. Girault also secured first place and carried out the Petit Palais. It is interesting to note that little more than two months were allowed for the preparation of these designs, and that the jury arrived at its decision in a fortnight, despite the fact that some two hundred designs were submitted. Only a clear appreciation of the right method could enable such a large jury to arrive at a good decision in so short a time.

I could, of course, give you similar brief summaries of many other important competitions, but it will be of more value to pass on to the investigations that have been made as to the methods which should govern procedure in such cases.

One of the earliest undertakings of the Royal Institute of British Architects was the appointment of a committee to consider public competitions. Their report is well worth perusal, but I can only now give you a few extracts as showing the point reached at the date of the report, 24th January 1839. In view of the close approximation of this date to that of the creation of Pecksniff perhaps the most amusing paragraph is one running as follows :

"A much more serious train of evils is entailed upon the public and the profession by the facility with which the system lends itself to collusion, many instances of which have been amply proved to your Committee, but to which they think it inexpedient more fully to refer. . . ."

The rest of the paragraph consists of a decorative pattern in asterisks. There are other paragraphs that bear more seriously on the problems of the present day. One runs as follows :

"The arguments advanced in favour of competition are sufficiently forcible. Emulation is said to be the soul of excellence in the arts and sciences—the recognised talents of the elder professor are supposed to be maintained in activity and progressive improvement, and his employers to be protected from the routine manner which security in public patronage and private practice are too apt to produce : while the opportunity is afforded to the young aspirant to take that place in public estimation to which his talents may entitle him."

Again, we find :

"But whatever the conditions may be, they ought to be clear and explicit, that the competitor may know precisely and unequivocally upon what he has to rely. Whenever it may be expedient to lay down definite instructions, they ought to be strictly adhered to, when judgment is to be founded upon them, and every design rejected which shall be found not to conform to them.

"In framing instructions care should be taken to distinguish accurately between the objects to be attained, and the means of attaining them. The former cannot be too accurately ascertained, or too explicitly described ; but the latter should be left as much as possible to the architect, for otherwise a proper scope will not be afforded for the exercise of a variety of suggestions, and one great end of competition will be frustrated. If however there should be a decided bias in favour of any particular style or mode of composition, it ought to be ascertained and stated in the instructions."

and in another paragraph :

"The formation of the programme upon which competitors are required to frame their designs becomes therefore the first essential point for consideration, and a deficiency on this point is perhaps the most general evil in the present system. The precise objects to be attained, the most desirable means of attaining them, the circumstances that must control the plan with regard to the site and other localities, the sum of money to be expended, and many other particulars in which every case of competition brings its own, are seldom ascertained and settled so as to lay the groundwork of well-defined instructions upon which competitors may proceed. When the decision is to be made, the judges discover for the first time that they have been ignorant of their own intentions ; their loose and ill-digested instructions are abandoned altogether, and the architect, who has acted with the greatest good faith in adhering to them, is the first to be deprived of his reward. In another view of the case, an architect, who may have suggested a design not reconcilable with the crude, undigested, and perhaps contradictory preconceptions cast into the programme, may virtually exclude himself from the competition, and his employers from the adoption of his ideas."

In a pamphlet written in 1861 the late M. César Daly deals with Competitions for Public Monuments. The term "monument" of course has a wider significance with the French than with us, and includes all important public buildings. M. Daly takes the view that the competition is vital to architectural progress, and emphasises the following conclusion :

"We require the competition as indispensable for ascertaining periodically and definitely the direction of architectural ideas."

He regards the nomination of the jury (the jury system is not questioned) as the greatest technical difficulty in a competition, on account of the demand that all schools of thought should be represented, and the difficulty that these have in finding a common ground on which a logical decision may be based.

After canvassing the various interests that should be represented on the jury for an important public building, he comes to the conclusion that it should number thirteen, appointed as follows :

L'Institut	} to nominate jointly	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
L'Ecole des Beaux-Arts		...	...	...	...	...	...	
Le Conseil des Bâtimens Civils		...	...	...	...	...	...	
Le Comité des Monuments Historiques	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1
La Société Centrale des Architectes	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
L'Administration	Administrators	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
	Laymen	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
The Competitors	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
								13

He supplements this by a note that some buildings cannot be thoroughly understood without the advice of a technical expert familiar with their uses, but in a jury of the size suggested he naturally sees no difficulty in including one so qualified, either with or without a vote.

M. Daly goes at some length into the methods which should be taken by the jury to reach a decision, but in regard to these I can only refer you to his work, which is in the R.I.B.A. Library. He continues with the modifications necessary in forming the juries in provincial centres, suggesting one partly local and partly national, and at the end advocates the competition as of great importance in encouraging an active interest in architecture among the general public. He feels that were full advantage taken of the opportunities it offers in this direction, architecture might once more take the place it held in the sixteenth century as an art generally understood and widely appreciated.

In 1908 the R.I.B.A. appointed a Special Committee on the Jury System of Assessing Competitions, which reported on the 10th November 1908 as follows :—

" 1. That in competitions for works, estimated to cost £100,000 or over, the jury system be adopted, subject to the following conditions :—

(a) That such jury shall consist of three architects of experience and ability ;

(b) The Chairman of such jury shall be nominated by the President, and the other members by the Competitions Committee.

" 2. That in competitions for works estimated to cost between £30,000 and £100,000 there shall be one assessor and two assistants, subject to the following conditions :—

(a) That the assessor shall be nominated by the President, and shall be responsible for and make the award.

(b) That the assistants shall be nominated by the Competitions Committee, and their duties shall be advisory only.

" 3. That in competitions for works of less value than the above the present system of assessing shall continue.

" 4. That the scale of fees for assessing competitions at present set out by the R.I.B.A. be adhered to.

" It is suggested that the full fees be divided in equal shares between the three assessors after deduction of 30 guineas which the Chairman should receive.

" A similar division should be made in the case of the assessor and two assistants.

" 5. That the above Resolutions should be regarded as framed for the guidance of the President, who shall have discretion to vary their application as circumstances in particular cases may require.

" 6. That, subject to the approval of the Council and the sanction of a General Meeting, the foregoing suggestions be incorporated in an official R.I.B.A. Paper headed ' Regulations as to Assessing Competitions,' with sub-heading as follows :—' Subject to special circumstances, which in the judgment of the President may justify their variation, the following rules should be adopted with regard to the assessing of Competitions.'

" 7. That the Competitions Committee shall prepare a list of Assessors for the assistance of the President. Such list to be revised from time to time, at least annually."

A Minority Report in the following terms was appended :—

" The undersigned members of the Competitions Committee, while cordially supporting the recommendations of the Committee, feel impelled to add that it is their view that the present dissatisfaction is due, less to the existing methods of assessing, than to the lack of any defined and recognised standard as to the qualities that should distinguish a fine building, and that in default of such a standard no system of assessing, however perfect in itself, can do more than mitigate the evil.

" They consider therefore that the best efforts of the R.I.B.A. should be directed towards promoting a unity of aim in regard to architectural expression. This, however, does not appear to be a question on which any immediate practical recommendation is possible, being a matter of slow growth, the outcome of a better system of education. In the meantime the absence of such unity must affect the method of assessing, and the divergence of aim and difference of opinion among architects make some application of the jury system more than ever advisable.

" They believe that a jury such as is recommended by the whole Committee for large competitions might eventually be adopted for all, provided some means of remuneration could be devised that would be generally considered reasonable. It may be pointed out that this difficulty would disappear if the view (now held by many) becomes general—viz., that the office of Assessor is one of distinction rather than profit, and that architects should not allow the question of remuneration to outweigh the interests of the profession as a whole, and should be prepared to act in an honorary capacity if these interests demand it.

" In such a case, fees on the established scale might be made payable to the R.I.B.A., who would call upon its members to act as assessors for such remuneration as the competitions fund might admit."

From these sketch outlines of the history of architectural competitions it will be clear to you that knowledge has usually been very much in advance of practice. Two reasons may be adduced for this. The first is the lack of a systematic training in the profession as to what the essentials of architecture are. With the greatest artists these essentials are comprehended by intuition, and it would be unfair to expect their formulation. But in an art such as ours it is necessary to the formation of a proper judgment that they should be recognised and formulated, and this is the work for those who have the capacity to do it.

Training in architecture, in this country at any rate, has always been rather haphazard and empirical. This was not so serious when only those who had the strongest possible natural bent towards it took up the profession, but when the doors were more widely opened, the educational methods should have been more definitely organised than has been the case, and the logical basis on which our art now rests made the foundation of its study. Had this been done the professional handling of competitions would have been a much easier matter and the results much more satisfactory.

The second reason why our practice does not reach our standard of knowledge lies in the necessity for compromise in dealing with promoters, who often only partially understand the real purposes of a competition, and even when they do, are technically inexperienced in the methods best suited to achieve these.

Now I wish to be quite fair to promoters, and I must say that, when recommendations are put lucidly to them from a clear, logical standpoint, it is my belief that in most cases they would accept advice so supported. The responsibility for seeing that they receive this rests with the architects, and more important competitions have fallen short of the standard they might have reached by our own default than by reason of any intentional malpractice on the part of promoters.

I shall be able to deal with these points more clearly by taking the three parties to a competition in turn, and endeavouring to define the functions of each, in relation to the methods by which, in my view, they can best discharge their respective obligations.

These three parties are :—

(1) The promoters. (2) The assessors or jury. (3) The competitors.

The promoters may or may not schedule their requirements before inviting professional aid, but this is almost the full extent of what can be profitably undertaken without consultation with the professional advisers who are to conduct the competition. It is therefore more convenient to consider the functions of promoters and assessors together. We can realise more clearly the relationship between them if we grasp the fact that it is in every respect similar to that between client and architect during the earlier stages of any projected building work. Just as the architect gives advice on the suitability of a site, adequacy of cost, accommodation needed, and all other matters that are not predetermined by force of circumstances, so those that adjudicate in a competition should advise the promoters. The fact that a competition is to be held in no way justifies the abandonment of these preliminary consultations.



No reasonable man in employing an architect fails to consider his advice, even if he does not always take it, from the very beginning of the undertaking, and promoters ought not to deprive themselves of this, even though the ultimate architect has yet to be selected. The idea that everything must be in shape before the assessor or assessors is appointed is utterly wrong, and has been responsible for the comparative failure of many a competition.

On the architect's side this responsibility has not received much more definite recognition than with the promoters. Assessors have often failed to realise that they ought to give the same meticulous consideration to the various aspects of the proposition as they would in the case of a building they were invited to carry out themselves. It is their duty to see that the interests of the promoters suffer in no way through the successful competitor not having been in personal touch with them from the beginning, and assessors can best realise this requirement by regarding themselves as representing the unknown competitor who will ultimately take up and continue their work.

Continuity from start to finish, such as we find in non-competitive work, is the great need in competition practice. At present there is a tendency to cut it up into three distinct stages, greatly to the detriment of the result. The first stage before the appointment of the assessor or jury, the second during their appointment, and the third after the selection of the design.

To put competitive practice on a sound basis, the breaks between these stages should be bridged over, and I venture to suggest a procedure by means of which this may be achieved. I do not say that there may not be better ways: the one I put forward is merely a suggestion as to the type of procedure that might be appropriate.

Let us assume that some public body is promoting a competition and has appointed a building committee. After some preliminary discussion they would ask for the appointment of an architectural adviser and depute two well-qualified members to confer with him, possibly the chairman and city engineer, or chairman and medical officer, according to the class of building. These three would draw up the programme. Before issuing this, two other independent architects would be added to form a jury of five, and on the programme having been agreed by them, it would be issued to competitors. The usual stages of questions, replies, and receipt of designs having been passed through under the supervision of this jury, its members would jointly make their award, dealing very fully with all the considerations necessary to inform the successful competitor as to any fresh aspect that has occurred to them during the adjudication. Their award might be in two parts, one for publication, and the other more in the nature of a confidential communication to the selected architect in order to make him conversant with problems and difficulties that may affect the further development of his design.

I do not think I need say more on the promoters' share in a competition, and will now turn my attention to the assessors.

I have often heard it said that a good architect is necessarily a good assessor, but to my mind this is not the case. The expression of personality within the confines of architectural technique is the measure of artistic quality, but the less imaginative man with a better training in technique may be superior as a judge to the greater artist who is perhaps unable to analyse the operations of his own mind.

Apropos of this, the following remarks by Richard Wagner are interesting:—

"How," wrote Wagner in 1856, "can an artist expect that what he has felt intuitively should be perfectly realised by others, seeing that he himself feels in the presence of his work, if it is true art, that he is confronted by a riddle, about which he, too, might have illusions, just as another might?"

"I must confess," he further writes, "to having arrived at a clear understanding of my own works of art through the help of another, who has provided me with the reasoned conceptions corresponding to my intuitive principles."

Now the same intuition that enables an architect devoid of the analytical faculty to produce a brilliant design may empower him to select the ablest one submitted in a competition. That is not the weak spot in his equipment as an assessor. This will be discovered in the earlier stages, such as discussions with the promoters and the preparation of the programme. To place the issues properly

before a clear-headed business or professional man whose experience is outside the technique of art demands a faculty of logical exposition and an experience of the difficulties involved which are not essential concomitants of imaginative force. Of course "the legal and logical mind" is useless without artistic ability, but artistic ability is equally useless in this case if its methods are intuitive.

You will notice that in my suggestion for the conduct of a competition I have introduced one of the architects a stage earlier than his two professional brethren. I have done this in order to take advantage of employing one, specially qualified by his attitude of mind and his experience, to thrash out with laymen those points of detail and method that are so often misunderstood. He is thus "the fore-runner" who paves the way for his association on the jury with one or more whose artistic qualifications may perhaps rank higher, but whose limitations in other respects might preclude their being entrusted with the conduct of a competition.

As a general rule, experience as a competitor is almost essential as a qualification for the single assessor, but in the case of a jury this experience may be dispensed with in some of its members if it is in other respects advantageous to have a wider field for selection.

To use the phrase quoted from César Daly, "The direction of architectural ideas" is subject to gradual change, and the pioneers of one generation become the exponents of the academic school in the next. In order, therefore, that vital fluctuations in our art shall receive due appreciation it is desirable that the adjudication of competitive designs shall not be entirely in the hands of the older and more experienced men, whose sympathies are liable to incline towards the earlier as against the newer methods. At the same time experience and mature judgment are invaluable, so that one of the chief recommendations of the jury system is the facility it affords for securing both the experience of the elder and the fresher point of view of the younger men.

Finally, we come to the competitor, who, when he has decided to compete, sets down to master the programme, or conditions as the document is more usually called. Actually the conditions include the programme, which is the part essential to the preparation of the design. If the programme is well drawn up it should at once give the competitor a good general impression as to what the promoters have in their mind; if it is not, the competitor, by much reading and re-reading, will gradually obtain, from accidents of phrasing here and there, some idea of the points to which importance is attached. With a good programme no further questions should be needed, but with a bad one the competitor can help to patch it up by means of questions on salient points.

From the competitor's point of view the best programme is one that states clearly what is wanted but makes no attempt to indicate how these wants are to be provided for. As a rule the allocation of the relative positions for the accommodation asked for is a mistake, tending to hamper freedom in the conception of the design. If special requirements have to be met, it is far better that these should be thoroughly explained than an attempt made to anticipate the competitor's work by specifying some definite arrangement.

In passing, I might refer to the value of a brief introductory note consisting of two or three stimulating phrases intended to place the idea of the building desired vividly before the competitor.

Many of the Prix de Rome programmes are excellent in this respect, and I will quote from two or three at random:—

#### 1884. A THERMAL ESTABLISHMENT.

"This Establishment, situated in a deep valley of the Pyrenees near an important seaside town, should be arranged in a manner recalling that employed by the Romans for the Thermes erected by them in conquered provinces.

"One must, however, take into account the changes that the period, the manners and customs, or the needs of the climate introduce into this type of establishment."

#### 1888. HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

"Legislative power is exercised simultaneously by the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, which are sometimes united in Congress, especially when the election of the President takes place or for the revision of constitutional laws.

"The proposed building is to accommodate both Chambers, the general arrangement will be similar for both, the

sole differences being those due to the number of members belonging to each—namely, 350 in the case of the Senate, and 550 in that of the Chamber of Deputies. The building would thus be divided into two main blocks, each forming a complete whole, grouped up with the Congress Hall and its adjuncts."

1891. AN IMPORTANT RAILWAY STATION, WITH ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES AND AN HOTEL.

"This extensive group is placed around a public square, gaining all its monumental effect from the following arrangement:—

"The Station is a terminus and is presumed to be at a height sufficient to admit of access to the hotel on one side and the offices on the other without obstructing the routes for the vehicles of those arriving and departing.

"These routes are on each side of the station parallel to the lines. On the departure side there should be large vestibules entered under glazed porches, offices for tickets and registration of luggage, cloak rooms, etc., waiting rooms, and offices for the staff. On the arrival side an extensive shelter for vehicles, vestibules, halls for distribution of luggage, Customs examination, etc., etc."

There is much more, all helping towards a visualisation of the business of a great terminus.

To return to our competitor: having mastered the programme to the best of his ability, he then turns his mind to its solution. In order to do this he must have formed a conception as to what the dominating factors of the problem are. These are very varied according to the class of the building. In one case aspect may be the most important consideration, in another the relative value of the groups of accommodation, in another the special peculiarities of the site, or perhaps the axial placing of the building, not to mention numerous other factors less frequently the dominant ones. Then we come to the demands next in order of importance, and the attempt must be made to reconcile these with that placed first.

Somewhere about this stage the competitor will have had to form an idea of the general massing of his building and of the subdivision of this into various sections. This subdivision may be mainly vertical, as in the case of a hospital, or mainly horizontal as is the usual practice with public offices, or a mixture of both.

There are short cuts towards obtaining this idea of mass, but most competitors have adopted those most suited to their own methods, and these also vary so greatly with different classes of building that I feel it impracticable to deal with them in the time at my disposal.

Moreover, these are details. The main object to keep in view at the earlier stages of a competitive design is the retention of everything in as plastic a form as possible, so that all possible alternatives may be considered and compared before too much time is taken up with the detail of any one of them. It is most annoying, after having spent much time and skill in working out the detail of a scheme, to be forced to the conclusion that it is wrong in principle; for as we all recognise that competitions are, or ought to be, decided on their general merits as a solution of a definite problem, we cannot feel any hope of success with one, however brilliant in detail, that fails in our own view in its main conception.

Holding the views I do with regard to the basis on which a competition should be decided, I must point out how rarely is the double competition of advantage to those competing. The double competition has its uses where the promoters and their advisers have been unable completely to formulate their views, but almost its sole use is in placing before them a series of definite solutions from which they can realise how they have failed to grasp and express all that they had in mind. They are then able to supplement the programme and secure a design more closely approximating to their requirements. If this is clearly recognised it disposes of any argument for or against double competitions. The promoters are obviously entitled to claim that the problem is so complex that only by means of a double competition can the best result be secured, but solely on the ground that only after seeing sketch solutions can all the difficulties be realised. After all, one's private client has often to see two or three sets of sketches before he can fully explain himself. The main difference is that the assessors could usually clear up difficulties of this kind, and where they can the double competition becomes unnecessary.

I ought not to omit a brief reference to the International Competition. Considerable dissatis-

faction has been felt with the results of many of these, and so long as there are such marked national distinctions both in architectural ideals and in the whole training of the architect, it will be difficult to avoid this. It is all very well to regard art as a universal language, but if it is, the dialects differ vastly, and no civilised people capable of developing a national form of expression can be equally satisfied with any other. Therefore each member of an international jury will probably have an instinctive bias towards the work of his own countrymen, and however impartial each may desire to be, it is very difficult to arrive at unanimity. It is as if the exhibits at a flower show were all mixed up and you were asked to decide as to the finest flower amongst them. Now and then we may find an architect temperamentally qualified to adapt his ideas to a foreign environment, but except in such a case it is unlikely that his work will be entirely acceptable in a country not his own.

This Paper ought not to close without mention of the Regulations for International Architectural Competitions which were settled at Paris in 1908 by a Special Commission consisting of representatives of the various nations represented on the Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux des Architectes. Some interesting notes on the principal points discussed by the Commission will be found in the Report of the British Delegate, Mr. John W. Simpson, published, together with a translation of the Regulations as finally adopted, in the Institute JOURNAL of 9th January 1909. The original French text was published in the JOURNAL of 6th March following. The Regulations for International Competitions are among the professional Papers published in every issue of the Institute KALENDAR.

Perhaps I have taken you rather beyond the point suggested by the title of my Paper, but my excuse must be that we have not at present reached a point of finality in competition methods, and evolution in the past naturally leads up to the progress we hope to see in the future. Therefore, without going into technical details, I felt bound to give some slight indications of the possibilities in this direction, and now close my Paper in the hope that it may give rise to a useful discussion on aspects over which I have perhaps glanced too lightly.

## DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER.

MR. ERNEST NEWTON, A.R.A., *President*, in the Chair.

MR. ALFRED W. S. CROSS, *Vice-President*, in moving a vote of thanks for the Paper, said that, although Mr. Lanchester had been unable to find any definite records of architectural competitions in ancient Greece, yet it was difficult to believe that the Greeks were unaccustomed to them. For the principles of competition and the spirit of emulation were so pronounced among the Greeks as to amaze their Persian enemies, who, during their great invasion of Greece and the subjugation of Athens, found the youth of that city voluntarily undergoing severe courses of physical training in connection with the Olympic games—not for wealth, but for glory. It was well known that public competitions were held in connection with trials of skill in literature, rhetoric, sculpture, and stage productions. Indeed, the beautiful Choragic Monument at Athens commemorated the victory gained by the chorus trained by Lysicrates in one of the annual dramatic contests. With this and other examples resulting from the universal application of the competition system to all branches of art, it may be reasonably assumed that many of her famous ancient examples of architecture owed their being to the same familiar principle. In a vain

search among the voluminous works of their old friend Herodotus for some remarks on architecture at Athens he had come upon a few lines that were certainly germane to the competition principle. It appeared that after the great naval victory at Salamis the prizes for valour were awarded in accordance with the votes of the candidates themselves. Thus, to those men who were deemed to have won distinction two votes—one of primary and one of secondary importance—were allotted. The inevitable happened. When the votes were counted it was found that each commander had nominated himself for the first prize. But a closer scrutiny of the votes revealed the fact that an overwhelming number of secondary votes had been recorded for Themistocles, to whom, by universal consent, the much-prized olive crown was awarded. Now, inasmuch as many architects were convinced that in some way or another competition designs should be assessed by the competitors themselves, some such system as that adopted by the Greeks for awarding distinctions gained in war might be tried in this country in connection with architectural competitions. As to Brunelleschi's dome at Florence, Vasari's description of the competition made



interesting reading. Fresh from the close study of many ancient Roman domes, Brunelleschi had determined upon the constructional principles he should adopt in the event of his services being retained for the work. But, although he had made a model, he was afraid to exhibit it, "knowing," to quote Vasari's words, "the imperfect intelligence of the assessors, the envy of the competitors, and the instability of the citizens who favoured now one competitor, now another, as each chanced to please them." The attempts to explain his ideas without exhibiting either plans or models in illustration of his proposals led to his being regarded as a fool and a babbler, and he was more than once dismissed, and on one occasion forcibly ejected from the public meeting at which he was vainly endeavouring to elucidate his proposal. This treatment caused Brunelleschi to say in after years that he dared not, at that time, pass through any part of the city lest someone should shout out after him, "See, there goes the lunatic!" The architect's final triumph, his quarrels with his colleague Ghiberti, and an extremely appreciative description of the famous dome, are all set out at some length by Vasari. Mr. Lanchester had discussed the competition for the completion of the Louvre in detail, but a few supplementary remarks might perhaps be of interest. He believed it was due to Colbert, who from the first determined that Claud Perrault's and not Bernini's design should be executed, that Bernini was ultimately sent back to Italy loaded with gifts and honours, and the French physician's stately structure of twenty-eight coupled Corinthian columns substituted *after* the foundation stone of Bernini's design had been laid by the King. Opinions differed as to the value of Bernini's work—his design had been preserved, but he (Mr. Cross) had never seen it. For instance, Fergusson said "that France might congratulate herself that nothing so horrible was perpetrated." On the other hand, Wren's one foreign tour was made at the time that Bernini was at work on the Louvre, and the great English architect appeared to have been very favourably impressed with the excellence of Bernini's work. As to the design, Wren remarked, "I would have given my skin for it, but the reserved old Italian gave me but a few minutes' view." But it must be remembered that at the time Wren visited Paris in 1666 his architectural powers were by no means at their zenith, and that often a phase of architectural work that would commend itself to a young architect would not be invariably received with favour by the man of more mature judgment. It was possible, after all, that Fergusson was right in his criticism that Bernini's elevation was too florid, and that the Government were well advised in substituting the French architect's design.

Mr. J. S. GIBSON [*F.*], in seconding the vote of thanks, said that probably the ordinary layman would find the bulk of Mr. Lanchester's remarks as difficult to understand and as uninteresting as the Florentine

gentlemen of centuries ago, who were interested in competitions as promoters, would have done. Architects, however, would feel deeply indebted to Mr. Lanchester for compiling a Paper which, in every sense, was of the greatest value to them. It was of value because scarcely any among the crowds of young men who took up the profession of architecture but at some time or another became involved in the meshes of a competition. Whether he liked it or not, it was almost certain that some day he would be drawn into it. There seemed to be a fatal fascination about competitions, and, once the young man began to take part in them, it was astonishing how much he learnt and how much good the experience did him. Had a Paper such as this been read at the Institute when he (Mr. Gibson) was a much younger man it would have opened his eyes to the fact that this sort of attempt to establish oneself in some kind of architectural position really formed a page in the history of the great evolution of architecture, not only in this country, but in every country. For many years the Institute had done valuable work in trying to conduct and organise and carry on the work of competitions in such a way that architects, as well as the promoters and others having interests in good buildings and good architecture, should have fair conditions, that promoters should have the best services architects could give them, and that everything should be done with a view to improving the quality of the work. When the Paper was published it would be well worth their while to read it most carefully; they would learn from it many things which would be of extreme value to them in the future.

Mr. A. E. RICHARDSON [*F.*] said he should like to endorse the appreciation which had been expressed of Mr. Lanchester's Paper. He (Mr. Richardson) did not understand much about competitions, but he had made some notes on their history. There was no reference in the Paper to any particular Roman competition; but in the Letters of Pliny he remembered reading some reference to a competition at Nicæa. A local architect was selected to design a theatre at Nicæa, but the foundations went wrong, and Trajan wrote in reply to Pliny's appeal for Roman architects, "Why send to Rome for architects, when you know full well we get them from Greece?" That was the only Roman competition he had encountered in his researches. Coming to the eighteenth century, Mr. Lanchester referred to the competition for a design for the Royal Exchange, Dublin, which brought forth designs from 61 architects and others, including doctors, lawyers, and military men. We know, of course, that architecture in Ireland, before the advent of Gandon, was in a very low state. Among the architects who competed were Thomas Ivory, James Gandon, Thomas Sandby, Thomas Crunden, George Richardson, and Thomas Cooley. The leading men, such as Adam and Chambers, thought the competition beneath their notice. Thomas Ivory's design was very much admired, though he did not receive the com-

mission, but he received a consolation prize in the form of a piece of silver plate. Passing over the interesting period of the early part of the nineteenth century, to the time when Cuthbert Brodrick competed for the design of the Town Hall at Leeds, Mr. Richardson remarked that Brodrick was twenty years of age when he won the competition for that magnificent building. The Committee were undecided whether such a young man should receive the award; but the Assessor very rightly said that a man who could produce such a design was equipped to carry it out. With regard to French competitions under the Second Empire, he thought the system of a double competition was sometimes a good one. It was not generally known that Garnier threw over his design for the Paris Opera House on being shown a plate of the fine theatre at Bordeaux; and the Paris Opera House was based on the plan of that theatre. A letter written by Professor Cockerell to the papers in 1857, on the system of competitions, might be said to shed a light on the competitions of to-day. He said: "The success of the system of competition depends primarily on the constitution of the tribunal appointed for the adjudication. This is the grand assurance of the integrity and the competency of the award, not only as doing exact justice to the public as respects the great object of the competition, but to the relative claims of those who have contributed their genius, experience, and expense towards that object. Without these secure foundations, the whole fabric falls to the ground, and our labours are fruitless and utterly abortive; adventurers alone will enter the chance medley; the ostentatious clap-trap takes the place of the soundness of design; fashion prevails over the permanent principles of art; true taste is put to flight; and experience, ever modest and real, shrinks from a tribunal in which it will be scarcely heard, much less valued, in the face of garish and attractive pretensions. The veteran declines to expose himself to the mortification and the injustice of a low standard of criticism: the public thus lose the advantage of long labour and devout studies; new names alone appear on the list of candidates, and the celebrities disappear from these most generous and interesting occasions: disgust and dissatisfaction generally follow." He thought Professor Cockerell's remarks most interesting, in view of the pernicious competition system of to-day.

Mr. ARTHUR J. DAVIS [F.] said he had been much interested in the Paper. There was one competition, and a very interesting one, in recent years which Mr. Lanchester had not commented upon—viz., that for the Church of the Sacré-Cœur in Paris. After the war of 1870 a number of eminent French Catholics, who thought the defeat of the French principally due to the lack of religion, got together large sums for the purpose of erecting a church which was to be a monument to Roman Catholicism in France and a request to the gods to forgive France for what was supposed to be her lack of religion. The

competition produced some very able designs, but, unfortunately, the winning design was not one of the best. They have all been reproduced, and some were extremely interesting. With regard to the competition for the Grand Palais, the plans of which Mr. Lanchester showed on the screen, some architects thought that it was a mistake to have put a dome on the Petit Palais at all. The avenue to the Pont Alexandre III. opened out for the purpose of showing up the fine dome built by Mansard, and it was a mistake to put the small one at the entrance of the vista, as it introduced a sort of anti-climax, and the stranger to Paris was not sure which dome belonged to it. The only other point was that the Place de la Concorde, which was originally designed with a moat all round, and which was placed behind the balustrades now there, was at that time inhabited by bears and wild animals. He did not know when the old moat was filled in; but in old prints this was shown.

PROFESSOR S. D. ADSHEAD [F.] said that Mr. Lanchester's Paper would be looked upon for some time to come as the standard treatise on competitions. He thought they might have heard during the discussion a little more criticism about the different methods of dealing with competitions; but the various speakers had refrained from treading upon that dangerous ground. He, therefore, should enter upon it with considerable reticence. In the jury system, as so ably expressed by César Daly, there seemed to be a danger of regarding assessing as work for a machine rather than for an individual. The award would usually be a compromise, and mere mechanical skill would be the first thing to count. The human factor ought not to be eliminated. He looked with some misgiving on a system of adjudicating competitions by jury.

Mr. H. HEATHCOTE STATHAM [F.] said that competitions were not adjudicated by a jury, but by a single assessor, and generally a committee were practically made to promise that they would bestow premiums according to the assessor's judgment. That, he thought, was one of the dangers of competitions. What was gained by the Council-appointed assessors was that the decision was always made in an honest way; every person appointed by the Institute gave the prize to what he believed to be the best design. But it was only the opinion of one man, who was fallible. It would be a better system if two or three assessors were appointed. One thing he had noticed several times was that competitions had been adjudicated upon by an architect who was very eminent as an artist, but who, perhaps, did not understand the particular system and plan required in the particular building. He could remember two or three cases in which the premium had been given to a design architecturally admirable, but which everyone knew was totally unsuitable in plan; and we had to remember that one man had only one judgment, and, as he said before, he was fallible. He thought they should rather look to a system of ap-

pointing two or three professional assessors, like a jury—people who were all competent, and would compare notes and, perhaps, correct special tendencies in any one of them.

MR. E. A. RICKARDS [F.] said he found himself at variance with Mr. Lanchester when he expressed doubt that the best architect always made the best assessor. He thought that a man capable of designing was the one best able to recognise tendencies in others. He was also at variance with Mr. Cross when he doubted whether Wren had the right point of view in expressing his opinion about Bernini's design. Bernini's design had undoubtedly great merit. Wren was not a very young man when he saw Bernini's design. Even if he had not been in architecture very long, he must have been a man of very great sensibility. There was the danger nowadays of not having the courage of one's youth. He (Mr. Rickards) hoped that he personally should not go back on his youthful enthusiasms. He thought Mr. Cross seemed to take up that point about Wren rather too eagerly.

MR. H. W. WILLS [F.] heartily supported the vote of thanks. Competitions, he thought, had found their excuse and justification in the very much greater attention which architects had been forced to devote to planning, because planning was the most important thing in architecture. Men had had to plan, and plan, and plan again, in order to have any chance of winning a competition, and it was that fact alone that had made them devote the attention they ought to devote to planning. The huge advance made since the planning of the 'sixties and 'seventies had been due almost entirely to the practice gained in architectural competitions. If he were to sum up the use of competitions in a sentence, he would say that it had been to combine the planning of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which, though grand in its main outline and disposition, was found completely unpractical when it was a question of arranging accommodation to the planning of the early and middle nineteenth century. It was by the combination of the two into one system that our buildings would be great gainers. And that was a result of the competition system.

THE PRESIDENT, in putting the vote of thanks, said that one thing struck him when listening to the Paper, and that was that, on the whole, the history of competitions seemed to show that, whatever the system of assessing, the scheme which was head and shoulders above all the others was generally successful. He mentioned this because it seemed to him that in that case competitors had the matter entirely in their own hands. The best man had merely to produce something which stood out as so much better than any other, and the assessor's work would be extremely easy!

MR. LANCHESTER, in reply, thanked the meeting for the cordial way in which they had greeted his effort. He wished he could take the optimistic view of the President, that the head-and-shoulders best

plan would always come out on top, however adjudicated. He should feel happier in his mind if he could think that. But he admitted that very often competitions had resulted in the acceptance from time to time of some of the most brilliant plans that had been seen in the history of the profession.

MR. HENRY T. HARE [F.] writes:—I have read with much interest Mr. Lanchester's excellent Paper on Architectural Competitions, and think that much good may result from the free discussion of the subject amongst architects, particularly those who have had personal experience of the many difficulties and pitfalls which arise.

The principle of competition is now so thoroughly established in the case of all works of public importance, that it becomes the duty of the R.I.B.A., as representing the best interests of architects and architecture, to use all its efforts to ensure that the outcome of such competitions should be commensurate with the enormous labour, thought, and skill which are expended on them. It is evident that a successful result can only be attained if a competition is conducted in such a manner as:—

(a) To attract as competitors the most able architects.

(b) To give the freest possible scope to the competitors to produce the best solution of the problem.

(c) To ensure that the best design, both from the architectural and practical standpoint, is selected for execution.

(d) To make it practically certain that the author of the selected design shall reap the fruits of his labour in the carrying out of the work.

To secure the first of these the terms and conditions of competition must be liberal and generous. Promoters may be reminded that they are obtaining from architects much more benefit than they would if they only had the work of one man at their disposal; therefore those competitors who may not be fortunate enough to secure selection are entitled to very generous treatment. On this will greatly depend the response from architects of experience in active practice.

The second essential is that no condition or stipulation should be introduced which would tend to hamper competitors in the evolution of their design, unless it is absolutely certain that such condition is imperative and unalterable. The neglect of this has resulted, in many cases, in the assessor being placed in the dilemma of either having to pass over the best design or to ignore his own conditions; and in either case the competition must be regarded as a failure.

As to the best method of ensuring that the best design submitted shall be selected, there is now no difference of opinion that the adjudication should be made by some person or persons with the highest technical knowledge and judgment. The Institute may, I think, congratulate itself that its consistent labours, extending over many years, to this end have resulted in the fact that no competition can now be

conducted successfully unless a qualified assessor is appointed to examine and report upon the designs submitted, and unless it is understood that his advice will be followed.

Mr. Lanchester quotes the report of the Special Committee of 1908, which recommends the appointment of a jury of assessors in important competitions, and rather appears to take it for granted that this is generally accepted as being desirable, and is the course officially followed by the R.I.B.A. I do not think, however, that this is so, for there have been important competitions, since 1908, in which only one assessor has been appointed by the R.I.B.A.; and, moreover, there is quite a considerable body of opinion against the "jury" system. I am one of those who entirely disagree with it, and consider that, given a competent assessor, a sounder judgment is likely to be arrived at by one man than by three. In all the competitions of recent years where more than one assessor has been engaged, I cannot call to mind a single case in which the award has given even limited satisfaction to archi-

tecs, and in several cases very strong dissent has been expressed.

One would say, *prima facie*, that in the multitude of counsellors there would be wisdom; but, in practice, I very much doubt whether it is so in this case. It seems to me that if the jury are unanimous in their opinion there can be no necessity for more than one of them. If, on the other hand, they hold different views as to the best designs, one of two things is likely to happen. Either the strong man of the jury overrides his colleagues, or a compromise is effected by the selection of an inferior design to which no one can take very decided objection. I have had personal experience of one or two cases in which the latter result has actually been arrived at; and there is at least one case in which the former is generally supposed to have happened.

Mr. Lanchester's suggestion that where a jury is appointed one of them should deal with the promoters in the early stages is, I think, an excellent one.

---

#### MR. BARR FERREE'S PROPOSED "CHRONOLOGICAL CATALOGUE OF BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED ARTS" [JOURNAL R.I.B.A., 22nd May].

##### MEMBERS' CRITICISM.

From Professor BERESFORD PITE [F.]—

I think that there are insuperable difficulties in the compilation of a complete list of buildings and associated arts, and I doubt its practical value if effected. From the quantity of the subject-matter it would never attain completeness, and I personally should desiderate a catalogue beginning instead of ending with 1800 A.D.

"Chronology" suggests a prime difficulty. It is often doubtful and subject to revision even when apparently settled by corroborative documents. Building chronology is progressive and indeterminate, and is as difficult to catalogue as a current.

"Buildings" suggests another stumbling-block. It will be impossible to include all or to settle the principle for exclusion. In mediæval cities—*e.g.*, Bruges or Canterbury—civil, domestic, and military buildings and works predominate, having very different relative values, and adaptations, restoration and ruin will defy the classification due to a catalogue.

"Associated Arts" provides a final quicksand. The arts, fine, industrial, applied, or decorative, are indefinitely mixed, and offer the widest field for analysis and discussion, fruitless, I fear, because unpractical.

Mr. Barr Ferree's idea of cataloguing an intellectual expression in material form universal as humanity, must fail owing rather to the nature of the subject than to his want of imagination and faith, for which I have a real admiration.

BERESFORD PITE.

From Mr. THEODORE FYFE [F.]—

As Honorary Secretary of the Records Committee of the Institute, I should like to offer a few remarks on Mr. Barr Ferree's proposal to compile a Chronological Catalogue of Buildings erected before 1800 A.D., as set forth in the last issue of the JOURNAL.

In the first place I think it will be generally admitted that the aim of our American confrère is a valuable one, to direct into one channel the efforts of all engaged in making architectural records which fall within the scope of the suggested work. I think also, after reading the proposals carefully, that they are sound in their conception of how the work should be carried out. There appears to be nothing in their wording to which one might reasonably make any objection, except a sentence near the beginning of Section III., as follows: "In the study of architecture it is more important to know when a building was built than its form and dimensions." This is misleading because obviously untrue in the *practice* of architecture as a living art, and though I feel sure the author only intended to convey an archaeological meaning, I would venture to suggest that his argument would lose none of its force if he left this sentence out. The historic side is of the utmost importance, without doubt, but the scope of the Catalogue could be immensely widened by interesting the student of practical architecture and those engaged in teaching him such knowledge. To this end the proposed inclu-



sion of a reference to the most important monograph on each particular building should be supplemented by a reference to the best drawing or set of drawings of the building, where such drawings could be referred to, or if published, in what manner.

A full consideration of the labour involved should be faced before such a scheme as this is undertaken by anybody. Mr. Barr Ferree appears to have faced it to a great extent, but I might point out that it is not only the dedicatory names of churches that will involve "enormous labour and research," but, to a much greater extent, the accurate chronological information for each particular building which he regards as the basis of his catalogue. If one is content to state that a building belongs, broadly, to the early, middle, or late part of a century, the matter becomes comparatively simple, and in the case of the *Architectural Association Sketch Book*, when any difficulty arose, the editors have adopted this procedure since the late W. G. B. Lewis retired from the editorial staff. Chronology, however, was not the primary appeal of the *Sketch Book*, and I fancy Mr. Ferree would consider that his Catalogue should be governed by stricter requirements. I can certainly testify to the enormous labour involved by any strict enquiry into architectural dating. The well-known buildings (let us call them 50 per cent. of the total for the sake of argument) offer small difficulty, but the more obscure may offer many and thorny ones. For any really comprehensive scheme, one would require, I fear, the co-operation of scholars of all nationalities.

This brings one naturally to the matter of expense. Mr. Barr Ferree deals with this when he comes to publication, but though I do not suggest for a moment that he could fail to count on the enthusiasm and honorary service of very many of the collaborators required by his scheme, the organisation necessary to secure their co-operation might in itself involve great labour, amounting possibly to several years of work, on the part of a few.

I might recall the schemes of kindred interest with which the Records Committee has already been in touch. In the first place the Committee itself, in 1910, inaugurated a system of cataloguing English buildings in much the same manner as is now proposed for the wider field, but suspended their labours when the excellent series of County Histories prepared by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments came into the field. In the second place the Committee has been consulted by Sir Laurence Gomme with reference to his catalogue of buildings of historic interest prior to 1750 A.D. in London.

I do not presume to indicate to what extent the Institute, as a body, should interest itself, financially or otherwise, in the scheme. This will doubtless be discussed at the proper time and in the proper quarter. The proposals now tentatively put forward by Mr. Barr Ferree, however, certainly deserve the attention of all interested in architectural research.

THEODORE FYFE.

From Mr. J. D. CRACE, F.S.A. [*Hon. A.*].—

It is perhaps a special and useful gift of all artists, and not least of architects, to dream magnificent dreams, and of such must, I think, be classed the "Chronological Catalogue of Buildings of Architectural Merit of all Countries" which is the subject of Mr. Barr Ferree's Paper. The proposal is stupendous—colossal—for it is to be a *complete* record, and "of all countries." It is only when one steadies one's thoughts to careful remembrance of the buildings of merit in one's own country that the mind can gradually realise how the vision ends in a vast, immeasurable perspective. Our cathedrals, village churches, mansions, manor houses, many of more merit than fame, would need how many volumes for even brief record and bibliography?

In France who shall count the buildings of architectural merit, and, even yet, in Belgium? In Holland, Germany, Austria, scarcely a town which has not fine examples. Italy has how many of which the tourist never heard? Greece, Spain, Portugal, not to mention other European countries.

But beyond Europe, how many thousands of interesting buildings—Egypt ancient and Mohammedan; North Africa with its countless monuments of a departed civilisation; Syria, Asia Minor and Persia; finally, vast India, needing a cyclopedia to itself; and other Far East countries of which we know so little. How shall the interesting and historic buildings of all these be brought into one catalogue—and for whose benefit? Who would purchase the huge work, if ever compiled?

No, it is a magnificent and colossal dream, but it is not a practicable one; nor is encyclopedic information likely to benefit art. Better is it for a man to study thoroughly what he can reach with the aid of good monographs than to gather superficial knowledge of the art of all the world.

Mr. Barr Ferree cannot realise how thickly the old world is strewn with its monuments of the past, and of these how valuable are some of those unknown to fame.

J. D. CRACE.

From Prof. CHARLES GOURLAY [A.], B.Sc., F.S.A.Scot., Royal Technical College, Glasgow—

Such a Chronological Catalogue of Buildings and Associated Arts as that proposed and outlined by Mr. Barr Ferree in the current issue of the *JOURNAL* would undoubtedly be of great value from every point of view. The idea is indeed a most interesting one. In support of it I may say that in 1894 Mr. Barr Ferree published in a magazine article a chronological summary in tabular form of French cathedrals which I have found to be most useful for reference. I understand from his article that he means the proposed catalogue to take a similar form, only that probably it would deal more fully with every building. If illustrations were not included I should consider it necessary to state in the catalogue where at least

the plan of the building referred to could be found. For it is a remarkable fact regarding many of the lesser known, but nevertheless architecturally important buildings referred to by historians, that their plans cannot be obtained, or are inaccurate, or do not distinguish between the parts erected at different periods. To obtain sufficient information about well-known buildings to enable correct plans to be drawn would not give much trouble, but for the minor buildings it would, in many cases, be extremely difficult. Such plans must, however, be obtainable in order that the catalogue may be a real aid to students. The reconciling of the opinions held by different archaeologists regarding the dates of parts of many buildings could only be carried out by experts of the highest standing who are willing to do so. For if all opinions on record regarding any structure are not weighed the mere cataloguing would not be of much service, and it would soon become obsolete. In conclusion, I must add that Mr. Barr Ferree has made an excellent statement showing the need and advisability of making such a catalogue, so that all who are competent and have the necessary time to devote to the execution of so great and so useful a work should lend a helping hand.

CHARLES GOURLAY.

From Mr. W. S. PURCHON, M.A. [A.], Lecturer on Architecture, University of Sheffield—

Mr. Ferree pleads ably for the publication of a complete catalogue of buildings of architectural merit, and he also goes a long way towards showing how this gigantic work can best be carried out. I feel that we must all agree with Mr. Ferree that the advantages of such a catalogue are so obvious that it is unnecessary to labour them, and I am sure there will be no difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of experienced men willing to help in the publication of this useful work. The amount of labour involved would doubtless be enormous, and so it is with some trepidation that I venture to increase it. How often have we been annoyed at discovering that local guide-books (and even more important publications) ignore buildings erected after "the curtain fell on Gothic art"? Mr. Ferree is willing to include all built before 1800, but I for one hope the catalogue will include all works of real architectural merit built up to the time of going to press. In visiting a town for the first time I should like to be able to visit its reference library, turn up the "Chronological Catalogue of Buildings," and discover not only the dates of the Gothic Church and the Renaissance Town Hall, but also the names of the designers of its best modern buildings. I should be disappointed, for instance, if under "London" I could not find references to the British Museum and Scotland Yard; and what should we think if St. George's Hall did not appear under "Liverpool"? I realise that including worthy modern buildings would considerably increase the labour, give rise to much more or less stimulating

discussion, and might lead to a few living architects resigning their membership of local societies because their buildings were being included and those of rival architects excluded by the local committee. These things we could put up with cheerfully, but we must not support the notion that architecture ended either in 1600 or 1800.

One more suggestion. I think it will be necessary in some cases to catalogue some great buildings under their own names as well as under those of adjacent towns; those who do not know their Tennyson might possibly not know the position of "Burleigh-house by Stamford-town."

These, however, are minor points; the main thing at present is that we, as a corporate body, should approve the scheme and agree to take over the responsibility for the English section as soon as the more pressing claims of "Kultur" will allow.

W. S. PURCHON.

From Mr. ALBERT E. BULLOCK [A.]—

I have read with interest the leading article in the current number of the JOURNAL by Mr. Barr Ferree, of New York, upon the suggested chronology of buildings. England is certainly doing its share in this respect since there are several Societies busily engaged upon the Historic Survey of Buildings, which consequently necessitates their chronology. I refer to the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England, the London Survey Committee, which is incorporated with the London County Council and issues publications illustrating the various districts of London, and the Topographical Society, all of which have Committees rendering voluntary aid in this respect. The difficulties of so gigantic a scheme as that suggested by Mr. Ferree are: (1) that it involves an enormous amount of voluntary service; (2) that the public here are not sufficiently concerned to assist financially in so laudable an object; (3) that the Central Bureau would have to include representatives from different countries upon its Executive Committee who have been engaged upon biographical or historical research in order to avoid the present possibility to overlapping districts; and lastly, funds to support a large amount of paid labour and printing for permanent staffs would be essential. It will be interesting to learn what financial support America would contribute annually to such a scheme.

ALBERT E. BULLOCK.

#### Books Received.

- The English Countryside. By Ernest C. Pulbrook. 1a. So. Lond. 1915. 7s. 6d. net. [B. T. Batsford, 94 High Holborn.]  
 The College of Preceptors: Certificate and Lower Forms Examination Papers. Midsummer and Christmas, 1913 and 1914. 4 vols. 1s. each net. [College of Preceptors, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.]  
 Victoria and Albert Museum: Review of the Principal Acquisitions, 1914. Illustrated. 116 pages. 1s. [H.M. Stationery Office.]  
 European War, 1914-15: Resolutions of Protest, Official Correspondence, &c., relating to the Destruction of Historic Monuments during the War. 4d. post free. [Messrs. Hooker, Westerham, Kent.]

## REVIEWS.

## CANADIAN BUILDING STONES.

*Report on the Building and Ornamental Stones of Canada. Vol. III. Province of Quebec. By Wm. A. Parks, B.A., Ph.D. 80. Ottawa, 1914. Government Printing Bureau.*

This well-illustrated volume of 300 pages is the work of W. A. Parks, B.A., Ph.D., and gives an instructive insight into the methods adopted by our Colonies for the compilation of scientific and practical data relative to natural resources. Though the work as a whole necessarily possesses more local than general interest, a great deal of useful information for those concerned with stone in this country will be found between its covers.

The book opens with a short chapter on the testing of stones, these pages forming a *résumé* of the more detailed account of tests given in Vol. I. Of special interest here is a description of apparatus for making shearing tests, which are but seldom considered in this country, though failure of stone by shearing is exceedingly common.

Following a short geological introduction, the limestones and sandstones of Quebec are discussed in some ninety and twenty pages respectively, the details given including not only many analyses, but working particulars from the various quarries, illustrated by some excellent photographs. The granites and other igneous stones are then described in a chapter of fifty pages, which includes some photographs of polished granite faces which vie in merit with the well-known similar productions by the United States Government of the granites of America. The marbles and serpentines which exist in this province in important quantities are next discussed, and these are also illustrated in colour, and the methods of cutting and handling the stone are described. The former process, showing how marble is cut in the quarry when a surface exposure is obtainable, is well illustrated in the Report. Slates and the rarer stones are finally discussed, and the volume concludes with a comparative series of coloured plates of limestones, an appendix of tests, and an index and bibliography.

Well "got up" and printed, this work is to be commended not only to the notice of stone users, but to our own Government as an example to be followed in this country. Britain is a veritable museum of stones, for probably in no similar area in the world are so many varieties of building stones available, and yet we possess no authoritative compilation in any way approaching that under review. This is not the fault of our geologists, who could readily assemble the data for such a work, but of a supine national authority which has never been far-sighted enough to economise by expenditure of this nature. The Treasury possesses funds for industrial development, and a modification of the Minute allocating such resources might well be made to admit of the compilation of a work of this kind, which would be a national benefit.

ALAN E. MUNBY [F.].

## CORRESPONDENCE.

The late Mr. Philip Webb.

4 Raymond Buildings, Gray's Inn, W.C.,  
7th June 1915.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Jack's note in the last issue of the JOURNAL is extremely valuable, but has he not overlooked the really important factors in the success of the work that he discusses? Webb's fine sense of the right handling of material and his capacity for designing beautiful detail contributed very much to the interest of his work, but these things do not make an architect, and I suggest that Webb's success grew mainly out of his power of conceiving a building as a whole. He evidently had unusual ability for clear, original thought—it showed itself constantly in a certain freshness and independence that marks his buildings—and this ability led him to an adequate grasp of the conditions to be met in each case, and to a ready conception of how they could be used in producing an effective building. His work is characterised by reserve and restraint, but it is particularly effective, and I think this shows his mastery of composition; he seems to have realised very fully the value of concentration and contrast. Another factor in his success, a less important one, but still valuable and akin to the last, was his skill in grouping the minor features of a building—chimneys, windows, gables, and the like. His work seems to me to be admirable in this respect. Then, I think, he showed from the first a very fine instinct for proportion and right scale, which are again great accessories to design, but are all too rarely found in much perfection. Another thing that he showed a good understanding of, and in a more reasonable and restrained way than his contemporary Butterfield, was colour. I judge that his influence in this respect was very strong and useful. In fact, as it seems to me, Webb had an instinctive perception of most of the factors of sound and successful architectural design: instinctive because it is displayed in his earliest works as well as in his later ones.

The fact of Webb's influence and the soundness of it are very widely admitted, and this would not be the case unless his work really possessed the qualities that I think are found in it. Still, it must be readily agreed that those which Mr. Jack has referred to are particularly characteristic of his work, and they probably appealed with great force to Morris and Rossetti and others whose co-operation helped to develop his abilities. We are indebted to Mr. Jack for the very clear and convincing account of Webb and his doings that he has contributed to the JOURNAL, and for the list of Webb's works that he has given us.

Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR KEEN [F.].



9 CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 12th June 1915.

## CHRONICLE.

### R.I.B.A. Record of Honour : Twelfth List.

#### *Killed in Action.*

ADAMS, LAURENCE KINGSTON [*Associate* 1913], 1st Lieutenant, 7th King's Liverpool Regiment. Killed near Festubert during night of 16th-17th May, while gallantly leading his platoon in an attack on the German trenches. Aged 28 years.

Lieutenant Adams was the son of Mr. William Adams, of Wyndcliffe, Birkdale, Southport, and was educated at Ellersay Park School, Wallasey, and at Shrewsbury College. He commenced his architectural education at the Liverpool University School of Architecture, taking his degree with first-class honours in architecture. After completing the University course, he remained for a year with Professor Reilly, and in 1909 joined the staff of Messrs. Wm. & Segar Owen, of Warrington, remaining with them until the Territorial Forces were mobilised last August, when he volunteered for foreign service.

His brother-in-law (Captain Marriott, of the same regiment, who also took part in the action) writes: "Lieut. Adams was set a difficult task, but he carried it out like the fine soldier he was; the attack was most successful, though our losses were heavy." Lieut. Adams had gained the parapet of the trench when he was shot through the heart. Some members of his platoon buried him in a quiet spot about a mile away, and set up a cross bearing his initials over the grave, the operation being carried out under fire.

TURNER, THOMAS EDWIN [*Student R.I.B.A.*], Lieut., 13th County of London (Kensington) Regiment. Killed while leading his men in an attack on the Aubers Ridge on 9th May. Aged 25 years.

Mr. Turner was the son of Mr. C. W. Turner, of Selwyn Lodge, Solihull, and was educated at Rugby. He served his articles with Mr. Charles E. Bateman, of Birmingham, and was afterwards in the offices respectively of Mr. Ralph Knott, Messrs. Scott & Fraser, and Mr. Ernest Newton, A.R.A. He was winner of the Birmingham Architectural Studentship in 1910, and was later awarded a Royal Academy Studentship.

Mr. Charles E. Bateman [F.] writes: "From the moment he entered my office I realised that I had in Mr. Turner a pupil of real promise, and I found that his character, combined with his ability and love of architecture, developed and grew each year, until at the end of his term, when he went to London, I was certain that with a wider range of study, and given the opportunity, he would not only excel in, but give distinction to any architectural work entrusted to him."

Mr. Ralph Knott writes: "It was a great shock to all of us at Adelphi Terrace House when we heard of Lieut. T. E. Turner's death. He was the finest type of Englishman—modest and retiring, but very capable; his kind disposition

made him a general favourite. Given the opportunity, he would have done beautiful, sincere work, for that was the man."

Mr. Ernest Newton, A.R.A., writes: "Lieut. Turner was in my office for some time. He was an able assistant, hard-working and conscientious. He was liked by everybody in the office, and I had a great regard for him and esteem for his honourable and upright character. An officer informs me that he was making quite a name for himself as an officer, and had already been promoted."

IRVIN, JOHN HAWKSMORE [*Probationer R.I.B.A.*], of the 4th Battalion Seaforth Highlanders. Killed in action on 9th May. Aged 26 years.

Mr. J. H. Irvin, who was the son of Captain T. M. Irvin, R.N. (retired), served his articles with Mr. Richard Crossland, of Harrogate, was afterwards with Mr. Horace Cubitt [A.] as improver, and later with Mr. Sylvester Sullivan [A.] as assistant. He joined the Seaforths on the outbreak of war, and had been at the front since the beginning of November. He met his death in the storming of the German trenches in Flanders, all the officers of his battalion sharing his fate, and only seven men surviving of his platoon. He leaves a young widow.

GALPIN, FRANK W., of the London Rifle Brigade. Killed in action on 13th May. Aged 24 years.

"A noble ending to a noble life, for his was a character of great charm and beauty," writes Mr. Henry James Wise [F.], in whose office Mr. Galpin was assistant. He had previously been with Mr. Bass, Quantity Surveyor, and in the Surveying Department of the Office of Works.

#### *Died from Wounds.*

HARRISON, CHRISTOPHER RENÉ [*Licentiate* 1911], Lieutenant, 3rd (attached 2nd) Leicester Regiment. Wounded in the night attack near Festubert, 15th-16th May, and died in the Military Base Hospital at Boulogne on the 24th May.

Lieutenant C. R. Harrison was the youngest son of Mr. Frederic Harrison, the distinguished historian and writer, and brother of Mr. Austin Harrison, editor of the *English Review*. He was born on 27th April, 1877, was educated at Clifton College, and took his B.A. degree at Merton College, Oxford. He was for some years in the office of Sir Thomas Jackson, B.A., and afterwards practised his profession in England and later in the Argentine. Returning home on the eve of the war, he obtained a commission in the Leicester Regiment, and had been at the front since February.

#### *Missing.*

BOWNASS, JAMES EVERETT [*Associate* 1909], Princess Patricia's Light Infantry. Reported missing.

#### *Wounded.*

MANN, HENRY WILLIAM [*Associate* 1914], Sergeant, Essex Yeomanry. During a charge near Ypres received a bullet wound through the left side. Now in the Bagthorpe Military Hospital, Nottingham.

DALGLIESH, KENNETH [*Associate* 1912], 2nd Lieutenant, 4th Leicestershire Regiment. Wounded 2nd May. Has suffered amputation of left arm. Is in the Base Hospital at Boulogne, and progressing favourably.

Lieut. Dalgliesh, owing to a shortage of officers, was doing extra duty in charge of an advanced post on the Messines Ridge, when he was picked off by a sniper. The bullet struck



him over the heart, but was turned into his left arm by the contents of his breast-pocket—flask, metal mirror, pocket-book, etc. Efforts were made to save the arm, but it was so severely torn, not only by the bullet, but by the glass and metal of his flask, that amputation became necessary.

JONES, LEWIS FAREWELL [*Student* 1907], Captain, 12th London Regiment. Wounded and in hospital in London. Making good recovery.

#### On War Service.

The following is the Twelfth List of Members, Licentiates, and Students who have joined H.M. Forces for the period of the War, the total to date being 41 Fellows, 284 Associates, 135 Licentiates, 2 Hon. Associates, 164 Students:

#### ASSOCIATES.

Bond, A. G. : Lieut., R.E. Railway Transport Establishment.  
Carmichael, D. A. : 2nd Lieut., 7th Royal Fusiliers.  
Coates, W. V. : 2nd Lieut., 9th Bn. Norfolk Regt.  
Fetherstonhaugh, H. L. : Canadian Field Artillery.  
Hobbiss, Holland W. : 2nd Lieut., 2/1 South Midland Warwickshire R.G.A.  
Homan, Matthew : Captain, 10th Bn. South Lancashire Regt.  
MacRae, E. J. : City of Edinburgh R.E.  
Mitchell, Wm. H. : 21st Bn. Royal Fusiliers.  
Pywell, W. J. : H.A.C.  
Rogerson, John : Major, Officer Commanding R.G.A. Clyde Defences.  
Ross, H. A. : R.E.  
Stedman, W. B. : R.A.M.C.  
Symmonds, W. : 35th Bn. Canadian Regiment.  
Williams, Stanley H. : 2nd Lieut., 8th Bn. Wiltshire Regt.  
Wilson, Ralph : H.A.C.

#### LICENTIATES.

Bevan, T. M. : 2nd Lieut., Glamorgan Yeomanry.  
Bowden, E. E. : 16th Bn. Middlesex Regt.  
Cogswell, A. E. : Major, 1st Wessex Brigade R.F.A.  
Deakin, F. M. : H.A.C.  
Ellis, E. M. : Lieut., H.A.C.  
Hewitt, S. G. : Lieut., 16th Bn. Cheshire Regt.  
Leahy, W. J. : Motor Cycle Section at the Front.  
Masters, F. N. D. : 2/8th London Howitzer Brigade, R.F.A.  
Moore, H. E. : Lieut., Royal Monmouthshire R.E.  
Morley, John : Major, The Cambridgeshire Regt.  
Newman, B. Leigh : Canadian Army Service Corps.  
Newton, Geo. : 2nd Lieut., Northumberland Divisional Cyclist Company.  
Pollard, Ernest A. : Lieut., 5th Bn. West Yorkshire Regt.  
Roberts, G. A. : Major, 1st Brigade Australian Imperial Force.  
Smith, W. M. : 2nd Bn. Transvaal Scottish.  
Stevenson, E. G. : Asst. Divisional Officer, Staff for R.E. Services.  
Sutherland, G. A. : Lieut., 2/5th Seaforth Highlanders.  
Weightman, F. N. : Northumbrian R.A.M.C.

#### STUDENTS.

Aslin, C. H. : Army Pay Corps.  
Blyth, C. K. : 3/15th London Regt.  
Bridgman, G. S. : R.E.  
Davis, H. S. : Captain, 5th Bn. Gloucester Regt.  
Dunkerley, L. R. B. : Lieut., 24th Bn. Manchester Regt.  
Francis, C. E. : Artists' Rifles.  
Goodwyn, C. C. : 2nd Lieut., Oxon. & Bucks Light Infantry.  
Hall, H. J. : Glamorgan Yeomanry.  
Howell, R. B. : 2nd Lieut., 4th Bn. North Staffordshire (att. 2nd Bn. Northumberland) Fusiliers.  
Knight, Stanley : R.E.  
Peters, K. : R.E.  
Rees, F. W. : 1st Glamorgan R.E.

Rignal, F. : R.E.

Sanders, J. E. : Lancashire Hussars.

Shurmer, S. E. : Motor Ambulance (Driver), France.

Stephens, W. L. : R.N.D. Engineer Unit.

Williams, Percy J. : 11th Bn. Welsh Regt.

Wilson, F. C. : Lieut., South Staffs Regt.

Lieut.-Colonel A. B. Hubback [*F.*] (of the Public Works Department, Kuala Lumpur), formerly Major 19th Battalion London Regiment, and now Lieut.-Colonel commanding the 20th Battalion, has received the following gratifying message from the Brigadier-General commanding the 142nd Infantry Brigade: "Very many thanks for myself and all ranks 142nd Brigade to yourself and the 20th Battalion for your really stout and able co-operation during the recent operations. We shall always remember it with gratitude."

Mr. Herbert Langman [*A.*], formerly of the Royal Engineers, is now 2nd Lieut., 12th Bn. Royal Warwickshire Regiment.

Mr. Stephen J. B. Stanton [*A.*], formerly of the Artists' Rifles, is now 2nd Lieut., 6th Northumberland Fusiliers.

Mr. C. Orlando Law [*Licentiate*], formerly of the 3rd Hussars, is now 2nd Lieut., Royal Engineers (Mounted Bridging Section).

Mr. Percy W. Lovell [*A.*], formerly of the Artists' Rifles, is now 1st Lieut., 6th (Territorial) Bn. Northumberland Fusiliers.

#### The War: Restriction of Building Operations: Civic Survey Work for the Relief of Architects.

The lamentable condition in which the building industry finds itself, owing to the discouragement by the Local Government Board of municipal building undertakings during the War, has received the serious attention of the Institute Council, and the following correspondence has taken place on the subject:—

Royal Institute of British Architects,

9 Conduit Street, W. : 10th May 1915.

To the President of the Local Government Board,—

SIR,—The Council of the Royal Institute of British Architects view with considerable anxiety the decision of the Government to restrict building operations throughout the country in order that all available labour may be organised for War work.

Architects have already suffered perhaps more than any other class from the diminution of private building on account of the War, and if municipal and Government building is stopped or very greatly reduced the unemployment and consequent distress amongst architects will be very serious.

Already a very large number of cases have come under the care of our Benevolent Society, whose funds will be quite inadequate to meet further abnormal distress.

Undoubtedly everything must give way to the urgent military needs of the country, and architects, who have already contributed some 1,500 men to the fighting forces, fully recognise this, and are ready to bear loyally their share of the burden; but they feel that, while the Government's action will probably not be productive of hardship to the labour employed in the building trade, the effect upon their profession of the wholesale abandonment of building work may possibly not have received the consideration that it merits, and, should the distress be as widespread as they have reason to fear, they trust that the position of



*Jas. Bacon & Sons, Newcastle-on-Tyne.*  
**Captain GEORGE EDWARD HUNTER,**  
 6th Northumberland Fusiliers, *Associate.*  
 Killed in action (see pp. 373, 402).



*S. J. Muir, Gerrard's Cross.*  
**W. LEONARD B. LEECH,**  
 Rifleman, 9th County of London, *Associate.*  
 Died of wounds (see pp. 373, 403).



*Swaine, New Bond Street.*  
**Lieut. CHRISTOPHER RENÉ HARRISON,**  
 3rd Leicester Regiment, *Lieutenant.*  
 Died of wounds (see p. 396).



*The Wykeham Studios, Victoria Street.*  
**THOMAS WM DOWSETT,**  
 Sergeant, Hon. Artillery Company, *Student.*  
 Killed in action (see p. 277).



*Swaine, New Bond Street.*

Lieut. THOMAS EDWIN TURNER,  
13th County of London Regiment, *Student*.  
Killed in action (see p. 396).



*B. & W. Fish-Moore, Canterbury.*

Lieut. LAWRENCE KINGSTON ADAMS,  
7th King's Liverpool Regiment, *Associate*.  
Killed in action (see p. 396).



*J. Weston & Son, Sloane Street.*

2nd Lieut. HENRY MONTAGU WHITEHEAD,  
4th Batt. East Surrey Regiment, *Student*.  
Killed in action (see p. 307).



*Chas. Nicol, Jesmond.*

ALBERT EDWARD LOWES,  
A.S.C. 6th Northumberland Fusiliers, *Associate*.  
Killed in action (see p. 337).

architects, whose professional work has been diminished by the Government's organisation of industry and economic resources, will not be overlooked.

If an opportunity is to be given to the representatives of interests affected by Government action to appear before the Royal Commission which has recently been appointed to consider what steps should be taken to compensate those who have suffered through the action of the State in the execution of measures necessary for the successful conduct of the War, the Council of the Royal Institute trust that they too will be invited to give evidence on behalf of their profession.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

IAN MACALISTER, *Secretary.*

To this letter the Local Government Board replied:—

*Local Government Board, Whitehall, S.W.  
22nd May 1915.*

*To the Secretary, Royal Institute of British Architects,—*

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant, I am directed by the President of the Local Government Board to say that the Government Committee on the Prevention and Relief of Distress appointed a special Sub-Committee to deal with the distress among the professional classes due to the War, and that this Sub-Committee has been in correspondence both with the Royal Institute of British Architects and with other Societies representing the interests of architects and surveyors with regard to the measures which may be taken for the assistance of members of these professions. A scheme of civic survey has now been approved by the Sub-Committee, who are prepared to recommend grants from the National Relief Fund in aid of it.

The President hopes that this scheme will be the means of giving employment to a number of distressed architects, and that the grants in aid will render your Society's Benevolent Fund adequate to meet the demands that may be made upon it.

I am to add that it does not appear to the President that the position of architects whose professional work has been diminished in consequence of the War would come within the scope of any tribunal which may be established under the provisions of the Defence of the Realm Act.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A. V. SYMONDS, *Assistant Secretary.*

#### **Further Grant to the Architectural Association.**

In the JOURNAL for 20th March reference was made to the difficulties in which the Architectural Association was placed owing to the loss of subscriptions of members and of students in the Schools who had given up their work and studies and enlisted for the War. The deficit on the present session was estimated to amount to as much as £1,000. In response to the appeal of the President of the Association, Mr. Maurice Webb, the Council of the Institute made a grant of £350, and, at the instance of Sir Aston Webb

and Mr. Macvicar Anderson, a further grant of £250 out of the balance of the Anderson-Webb Trust Fund. The Council have since been placed in a position to make a further contribution of £200—bringing the total contributions from R.I.B.A. sources up to £800.

#### **Sufferings of the Professional Classes.**

At a meeting held at Lady Northcote's residence in St. James's Place on 1st June for the purpose of considering the problem of distress among the professional classes owing to the War, Sir John Simon, the Home Secretary, appealed on behalf of the War Relief Council. The professional classes, he said, were among those upon whom the extra remuneration involved by the War was not likely to fall, and they were enduring much suffering. Many belonging to this class who had high hopes of entering on a successful career, and others who had contemplated a peaceful old age, were faced with the agony of anxiety concerning those near and dear to them. It was hard that these people, with England's future at stake, willing to play their part, should have to occupy their minds so much with individual difficulties.

Sir John Simon drew a poignant picture of the young architect, musician, or member of the legal or literary profession, with a promising career and a small but happy home, with health, ambition, strength, and willing to do his best for his country, suddenly oppressed by dire personal needs. There was also the sad and common case of the professional man who had stunted himself in order that his son should have a good education. Through no fault of his own his income had dropped, and people were not building houses, buying pictures, attending his concerts, or resorting as usual to litigation.

Major Leonard Darwin, who presided, said that still greater suffering confronted the professional classes whose savings were becoming exhausted, and who would feel the increasing strain in the winter.

An address was given by Sir John McClure, President of the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, who emphasised the Council's need of funds and its work in dealing with cases which could not be so effectually met by public organisations.

#### **Professional Classes War Relief Council : A Whistler Exhibition.**

An important exhibition of Whistler's works was opened on 1st June at the Galleries of Messrs. Colnaghi & Obach, 144-146 New Bond Street, for a period of six weeks. The display, which consists of pictures in oil, pastels, and drawings, should prove of exceptional interest, as it is the first exhibition to be opened since the "Memorial" of 1905. Thanks to the generosity of the collector, a lady who wishes to remain anonymous, the proceeds are to be given to the Professional Classes War Relief Council. The exhibition is open daily from 10 till 6, Saturdays 10 till 1 p.m.; admission, 1s.



**The Annual Elections: Scrutineers' Reports.**

The results of the Annual Elections are recorded in the subjoined Reports of the Scrutineers, which, in accordance with the By-law, were read at the General Meeting last Monday.

The Scrutineers appointed to count the votes for the election of the Council and Standing Committees for the Session 1915-16 beg to report as follows:—

635 envelopes were received—286 from Fellows, 342 from Associates, and 7 from Hon. Associates. The result of the election is as follows:—

**PRESIDENT.**—Ernest Newton, A.R.A.

**PAST-PRESIDENTS.**—Reginald Blomfield, R.A., Thomas Edward Colcutt.

**VICE-PRESIDENTS.**—*Elected*: Henry Vaughan Lanchester, 378 votes; Paul Waterhouse, 357; Sir John Burnet, 353; John Alfred Gotch, 306. *Not Elected*: Edwin Landseer Lutyens, Alfred William Stephens Cross, George Hubbard.

**HONORARY SECRETARY.**—Edward Guy Dawber.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
C. H. BRODIE.

**REPRESENTATIVES OF ALLIED SOCIETIES.**—Graham Clifford Awdry (Bristol), Robert Burns Dick (Northern), Frank Brookhouse Dunkerley (Manchester), Charles Kempson (Leicester), Adam Francis Watson (Sheffield), John Watson (Glasgow).

**REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION.**—Herbert Austen Hall.

**HONORARY AUDITORS.**—Robert Stephen Ayling, Arthur William Shepard.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman of Scrutineers.*

**MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.**

*Elected*: David Barclay Niven, 449 votes; Henry Thomas Hare, 440; Gerald Callicott Horsley, 435; Andrew Noble Prentice, 431; Edwin Alfred Rickards, 421; Stanley Davenport Adshead, 416; Percy Scott Worthington, 409; William Curtis Green, 401; William Gillbee Scott, 381; Herbert Duncan Searles-Wood, 381; Alexander Nisbet Paterson, 369; Walter Cave, 363; Albert Edward Richardson, 359; Arthur Keen, 344; Harry Redfern, 330; Henry Philip Burke Downing, 321; John James Joass, 312; Emanuel Vincent Harris, 311. *Not Elected*: Max Clarke, Samuel Perkins Pick, Arthur Rutherford Jemmett, Sydney Perks, Herbert Winkler Wills, Arthur J. Davis, Ernest Richard Eckett Sutton, Matt. Garbutt, Henry Victor Ashley.

627 papers were received, of which 15 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
GUY CHURCH,  
HENRY J. WISE,  
HAROLD A. WOODINGTON,  
EDWARD BOEHMER,  
ERNEST G. ALLEN.

**ASSOCIATE-MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.**

*Elected*: William Robert Davidge, 399 votes; Leonard Rome Guthrie, 399; Herbert Shepherd, 381; Horace Cubitt, 377; Herbert Arthur Welch, 337; Philip Edward Webb, 335. *Not Elected*: George Leonard Elkington, John Anderson, Leo Sylvester Sullivan, John Ernest Newberry.

604 papers were received, of which 7 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
BRUCE DAWSON,  
W. R. JAGGARD,  
JOHN H. BEART-FOSS.

**ART STANDING COMMITTEE.**

**FELLOWS.**—*Elected*: Edward Guy Dawber, 436 votes; Halsey Ricardo, 418; John Alfred Gotch, 414; Gerald Callicott Horsley, 404; Henry Vaughan Lanchester, 361; Giles Gilbert

Scott, 349; Arthur Keen, 348; William Adam Forsyth, 347; Edward Prioleau Warren, 334; Henry Heathcote Statham, 321; *Not Elected*: Henry Philip Burke Downing, Harry Redfern, Raymond Unwin, Arthur J. Davis, Harr Sirr, James Mitchell White Halley.

**ASSOCIATES** (unopposed).—Robert Atkinson, Hubert Springfield East, Leonard Rome Guthrie, Basil Oliver, Alfred Wyatt Papworth, Philip Edward Webb.

556 papers were received, of which 13 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
PAGET L. BAXTER,  
LESLIE WILKINSON,  
ROLAND WELCH,  
LIONEL U. GRACE.

**LITERATURE STANDING COMMITTEE.**

**FELLOWS.**—*Elected*: Andrew Noble Prentice, 494 votes; Paul Waterhouse, 488; Albert Edward Richardson, 463; Arthur Stratton, 462; Charles Harrison Townsend, 457; Arthur Thomas Bolton, 454; Edwin Alfred Rickards, 433; Charles Sydney Spooner, 427; David Theodore Fyfe, 420; George Halford Fellows Prynne, 417. *Not Elected*: Herbert Hardy Wigglesworth.

**ASSOCIATES.**—*Elected*: Martin Shaw Briggs, 404 votes; Herbert Passmore, 396; William Henry Ward, 394; Walter Lewis Spiers, 380; William James Davies, 325; Stanley Churchill Ramsey, 316. *Not Elected*: John Stevens Lee, Charles Edward Sayer, Thomas Simons Attlee.

566 papers were received, of which 2 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
E. ALEX YOUNG,  
ALBERT E. BULLOCK,  
T. F. AMERY,  
C. E. HUTCHINSON.

**PRACTICE STANDING COMMITTEE.**

**FELLOWS.**—*Elected*: Herbert Duncan Searles-Wood, 405 votes; Max Clarke, 375; David Barclay Niven, 364; George Hubbard, 342; Matt Garbutt, 336; Alfred Saxon Snell, 312; William Henry Atkin-Berry, 310; Herbert Osborn Cresswell, 306; Edward Greenop, 306; Alfred William Stephens Cross, 305. *Not Elected*: Sydney Perks, Alan Edward Munby, William Henry White, John Hudson, Francis T. Wiberforce Goldsmith, Henry Percival Monekton, Frederick William Marks, Ernest John Gosling.

**ASSOCIATES.**—*Elected*: Edwin Gunn, 466 votes; John Douglas Scott, 446; Horace William Cubitt, 444; Herbert Shepherd, 432; Percival Maurice Fraser, 427; Henry Albert Saul, 423. *Not Elected*: James William Stonhold.

569 papers were received, of which 11 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
THOMAS DAVISON,  
P. ION ELTON,  
HYLTON B. ELKINGTON,  
CHAS. A. DAUBNEY.

**SCIENCE STANDING COMMITTEE.**

**FELLOWS.**—*Elected*: Bernard Dicksee, 444 votes; William Edward Vernon Crompton, 423; Frederic Richard Farrow, 420; Charles Stanley Peach, 415; Harry Percy Adams, 412; Ravenscroft Elsemy Smith, 412; Robert Stephen Ayling, 405; Alfred Conder, 394; Allan Ovenden Collard, 384; Horace Cheston, 348. *Not Elected*: Ernest Flint, Osborn Cluse Hills.

**ASSOCIATES.**—*Elected*: William Robert Davidge, 430; George Leonard Elkington, 410; Robert John Angel, 386; Ernest William Malpas Wonnacott, 361; Digby Lewis Solomon, 339; Henry William Burrows, 332. *Not Elected*: Norman Odell Scarle, Charles Edward Varndell.

560 papers were received, of which 18 were invalid.

(Signed) H. FAVARGER, *Chairman* } *Scrutineers.*  
J. HERBERT BELFRAGE,  
OTTO S. DOLL,  
G. REGINALD FARROW.

**Alien Enemy Members: The Council's Decision.**

At the Business General Meeting of the Royal Institute held on Monday, 7th June, the Secretary announced that the Council at their meeting held earlier in the day had decided to delete the names of alien enemy members from the R.I.B.A. KALENDAR.

**Cities and Town Planning Exhibition: Professor Geddes' Acknowledgments.**

Members will recall the exhibition of maps and drawings in connection with town planning held at the Institute last December, the exhibits forming part of a collection got together through the exertions of Mr. H. V. Lanchester and others to replace in part Professor Geddes' fine collection, known as the Cities and Town Planning Exhibition, which had been lost on its way to India through the sinking of the *Clan Grant*. Many of the new drawings had been prepared, under the auspices of the Architects' War Committee, by architects whose ordinary business had been suspended owing to the war. The new collection was sent to Professor Geddes, and has been acknowledged in the following letter:

Madras: 10th June 1915.

DEAR FRIENDS AND FELLOW WORKERS,—Now that our first exhibition here has just closed, and we are packing up for the next one (in Bombay), the time has fully come to review the situation, and to realise how much we are indebted to you for saving it.

I can recall nothing more gratifying in my life than the cable which told us—before our letters asking for help towards re-organisation after disaster had got half-way home—that our hopes and requests were being anticipated before they had reached you; and that your work had thus independently and promptly, as well as generously, begun.

While, of course, we also here have been doing what we could (chiefly with Indian plans, and such European scraps as we could muster), you can imagine the anxiety with which we awaited your promised consignments, and the interest with which we have opened each as it arrived, like children peering into the Christmas stocking!

These hopes have been far more than fulfilled. We are not only delighted, but surprised—astonished—by the quantity, as well as rejoiced (and instructed too) by the quality, of the exhibits you have sent us. So many exhibits, so well chosen, so well executed! Our exhibition has thus been a success, and not merely a "*succès d'estime*." Even now the whole has not reached us; so that our approaching Bombay show may be looked forward to with confidence, instead of with the inevitable depression which we sometimes felt before the last.

You will be glad, too, to know that your trouble has not been wasted. Besides the people interested in this great, and in many ways beautiful, capital, there have been at the exhibition, mostly for a fortnight, and some for three weeks, the representatives of most

of the 65 towns and cities of the Presidency, which roughly compares in population and extent to the United Kingdom. Their mayors, engineers, etc., have been busy students, and we have had a practical class for the latter, revising the improvements now in progress. Something of the same kind may now be done in Bombay and in Calcutta also; so that in this way the cities are being reached, indeed more fully in some ways than as yet at home.

I hope that all who have shared in this reconstructive work of the exhibition have also found some pleasure in it; and that this is but a phase of that wider co-operation which we all may increasingly see before us, towards the renewal of cities—whether those destroyed by war abroad or those deteriorated in peace at home.

Your admirable work for us here shows in it the high tension of war time; yet the application to a better time coming. It has thus been more than a re-blazoning of old standards, an uplifting of new ones.

Once more then we thank you one and all; organisers and draughtsmen alike.—Heartily and gratefully yours,

PATRICK GEDDES,

*Director of the Cities and Town Planning Exhibition.*

ALASDAIR GEDDES,

*Assistant.*

**CAPTAIN GEORGE EDWARD HUNTER.**

KILLED IN ACTION, 26TH APRIL 1915.

The Dread Reaper following in the wake of nations at war is no longer content with the primitive scythe and the limited harvest provided by standing armies. Man, with developing ingenuity, has brought into being scientific machinery whereby his "last great Enemy" may garner more surely; not only those at one time allotted to war, but every section of the community must now be drawn upon to feed the devilish mechanism of extermination he has devised. The man of peaceful industry, the cultured pursuer of higher ideals, the searcher after truth, men in all walks of life, because of their still living faith in the destinies of their race, are found with lofty abnegation immolating themselves in order to stay the rush of Liberty's destroyer.

That the ennobling profession of architecture is not lacking in these great souls is being daily demonstrated in our midst; men brilliant in promise in their adopted calling, and above all great in moral worth and character, are sacrificing themselves uncomplainingly to crush this incarnate spirit of materialism that threatens to overwhelm us.

Of the many splendid young men who have added lustre to the annals of the R.I.B.A. by their sacrifice, no finer example could be found than in the person of the late Captain George Edward Hunter, the Associate who recently so gallantly gave his life in defence of his country.

Possessed of a singular charm of manner, generous to a fault, the soul of honour, strong and manly in body and mind, he was in truth most fitly described as a "gallant English gentleman." The fact that his bereaved parents received upwards of one thousand letters from his friends all over the country, testifying to the appreciation in which he was held, and that many of a humbler station in life felt moved to write and express their sorrow, speaks eloquently as to what manner of man was this.

He was born in 1887, and during his education at Aysgarth School and Charterhouse his natural inclinations and appreciation for matters associated with art showed themselves, and on deciding upon architecture for a profession he entered the office of Messrs. Cackett & Burns Dick, and for five years of pupilage industriously pursued his studies. Though accomplished in outdoor sports, he always succeeded in maintaining a good position in the professional classes he attended, and was successful in his sketching, measured drawing, and essay work. He was elected an Associate in 1909, but shortly after, much to the regret of all associated with him in the office, he left Messrs. Cackett & Burns Dick to join his father's firm, though he always kept in affectionate touch with matters architectural, and the close friendly relations with his former principals continued unbroken.

He received his commission in the 6th Battalion Northumberland Fusiliers in 1904, and on mobilisation enthusiastically devoted his whole time to the corps. He left for the front on 20th April, and, as stated in the Record of Honour in the JOURNAL of 22nd May, was killed whilst gallantly leading his men, with a total disregard for himself, on 26th April, near Ypres; his younger and only brother, Captain Howard Hunter, and just such another as himself, falling in the same engagement.

He was affianced to Miss Dorothy Angus, daughter of Colonel Angus, C.B., D.L.

If Architecture has not suffered by his loss, the Institute has at least been deprived of the ennobling influence of his moral worth, and the nation a son worthy of its greatness. She has many such, and so long as their spirit endures and is fanned into increasing volume by their willing self-sacrifice, her greatness will never wane.

*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*

JAS. T. CACKETT [F.]

R. BURNS DICK [F.]

## OBITUARY.

### John Macvicar Anderson, Past President.

At the moment of going to press the death is announced of Mr. John Macvicar Anderson, Hon. Secretary of the Institute from 1881 to 1889, and President from 1891 to 1894. He was in his 80th year, and had been a member of the Institute for over fifty-one years. He had taken from the first a great interest

in architectural education, and in 1905 placed at the disposal of the Council for educational purposes his entire holding in the Architectural Union Company, amounting to twenty-four shares of £10 each, and yielding about 7 per cent. He was one of the Trustees and a generous benefactor of the Architects' Benevolent Society. His portrait, an admirable likeness, painted by the late Charles Furse, hangs in the Institute Common Room.

### Charles Edward Mallows [F.]

The news of the death of Mr. C. E. Mallows, which occurred suddenly from heart failure, without any previous indisposition, on the 3rd inst., came as a great shock to those who had seen him apparently in good health but a few hours before. Mr. E. Guy Dawber, at the General Meeting on Monday, made feeling reference to the sad event, and paid a tribute of respect and admiration for the high personal qualities and attainments of the late Fellow. A biographical notice is in preparation for the next issue of the JOURNAL.

### William Leonard Boghurst Leech [A.].

Leonard Leech, whose death was recorded in the last issue of the JOURNAL, was the only son of the late Dr. A. H. Leech, of Broseley, Shropshire, and of Mrs. Leech, of 28 Egerton Gardens, Ealing, and was educated at Epsom College.

The sad news came as a grievous blow to all who knew him, more especially because of his lovable disposition and his keen enthusiasm for his chosen profession. It was characteristic of him and of his name—Leonard—that he should have persevered until he ultimately succeeded in enlisting notwithstanding that he had been rejected more than once owing to defective eyesight. The wounds he had received in the jaw (on 9th April at Hill 60) were of a very severe nature, but though he had endured the most intense pain and had been through two serious operations, the poor fellow bore his sufferings patiently and without a murmur. He was in a hospital at Boulogne for a fortnight before he was taken to H.M. Queen Mary's Hospital at Westcliff on 23rd April, and his death on 15th May was the first to occur there.

By his hard and conscientious work he had been progressing by leaps and bounds during the last year or two, his transition from student-work to that of the mature architect with a real and growing knowledge of architecture being quite remarkable. Members of the Institute who can recall his painstaking and accurate set of measured drawings of Southwell Minster will best realise how promising a career has been cut short by his untimely death at the age of twenty-seven.

His funeral took place, with full military honours, on 19th May, in lovely spring sunshine, in the quietude of his native land, at Sutton Cemetery, near Southend, in the presence of his mother and sister and other sorrowing relatives and friends. In the words of his mother, "it's such a beautiful, noble, and good life

gone; but he has done his duty for his country, and doubtless there is a rich reward for him."

BASIL OLIVER [A.].

Mrs. Leech writes: "It may interest you to know that my son offered himself five times, at different recruiting offices, and each time was refused because he wore glasses. During all the waiting time he did night duty as Special Constable. He was at last accepted on the 9th November by the Queen Victoria Rifles, and did strenuous training at Crowborough Camp. He refused corporal's stripes as it would have kept him longer in England, and 26th March saw him on active service with his regiment in Flanders. . . . He was left fatherless when seven years old, and has done well all through his life, and been a splendid son and brother."

## THE EXAMINATIONS.

The Final: Designs approved.

The Board of Architectural Education announce that the designs submitted by the following Students have been approved:—

### SUBJECT XX.

(a) FAÇADE FOR AN IMPORTANT FIRM OF FINE ART PUBLISHERS.

Brandon: C. J.	George: B.	Owen: A. T.
Bruce: J. C. C.	Graham: R. D.	Pennington: W. F.
Carey: R. W.	Hemm: G.	Rayson: T.
Cottingham: G. R.	Hull: V.	Reixa: F.
Day: N. F. C.	Hutton: L. D. H.	Stevens: F. J.
Duncan: R. A.	Jackman: F.	Tranmer: F.
Evans: T. C.	Kellock: A. D.	Tubbs: G. B.
Foot: A. A.	Lyne: D. R.	Wilson: J.
Foulkes: S. C.	Munguia: G.	Woodhouse: F. P. M.

(b) DETACHED SWIMMING BATH FOR A BOYS' PUBLIC SCHOOL.

Hall: R. B.	Roberts: E. W.
Holden: W.	Tanner: A. S.
Knight: S.	Vinden: G.
Middleton: V.	

## MINUTES. XV.

At the Fifteenth General Meeting (Business) of the Session 1914-15, held Monday, 7th June 1915, at 8 p.m.—Present: Mr. H. V. Lanchester, *Vice-President*, in the Chair; 15 Fellows (including 10 Members of the Council) and 8 Associates (including 1 Member of the Council)—the Minutes of the Meeting held 17th May, having been published in the JOURNAL, were taken as read and signed as correct.

The Hon. Secretary announced that Lieutenant Laurence Kingston Adams [*Associate*, 1914], Lieutenant Christopher René Harrison [*Licentiate*, 1911], and Lieutenant Thomas Edwin Turner [*Student*, 1913], serving with the British Expeditionary Force in Flanders, had been killed, or had died of wounds received in action, and it was Resolved that the Institute record its deep sense of sorrow for the loss of these young members, who had given their lives for their country, and that a message of sympathy and condolence be conveyed on behalf of the Institute to their nearest relatives.

The Hon. Secretary also announced the decease of Charles Edward Malloes, *Fellow*, elected 1900, a past member of the Council and of the Prizes and Studentships and Literature Committees; and of Robert Fellowes Chisholm, *Fellow*, elected 1871, who had contributed valuable Papers to the

Institute TRANSACTIONS, and it was resolved that a message of the Institute's sympathy and condolence be conveyed to the relatives of the late esteemed members.

The decease was also announced of William Lovell Mason, *Fellow*, elected 1896, and of Henry William Burton and Everard William Leeson, *Licentiates*.

The Secretary having read the reports of the Scrutineers appointed to direct the election of the Officers, Council, and Standing Committees for the year of office 1915-16, the Chairman declared the members duly elected to the respective offices, and, on the motion of the Chairman, a hearty vote of thanks was passed to the Scrutineers for their labours in connection with the elections.

The Meeting, following the precedent of last year, resolved that the names of unsuccessful candidates in the Annual Elections should be published, but not the number of votes polled.

The following candidates for membership were elected by show of hands under By-law 10:—

AS FELLOWS (17).

ATKINSON: Robert [A. 1910. *Title Prizeman* 1905].

GILL: Charles Lovett [A. 1905. *Ashpitel Prizeman* 1904].

HARRIS: Charles William [A. 1896] (Liverpool).

HOBSON: Laurence [A. 1898. *Arthur Cates Prizeman* 1897] (Liverpool).

HUTTON: David Bateman [A. 1906] (Glasgow).

NAYLOR: James John Sydney [A. 1905].

OMAN: William Campbell [A. 1902] (Singapore).

PECK: Frank [A. 1898].

PORTER: Horatio, M.A. Cantab. [A. 1891].

SAUL: Henry Albert [A. 1892].

Together with the following Licentiates, who have passed the Examination qualifying for candidature as Fellows:—

ALLAN: John Alexander Ogg [*Godwin Bursar* 1909. *Inst. Medallist (Essays)* 1910] (Aberdeen).

BAILY: Harold.

CARLESS: William Edward (Montreal).

COOKE: Samuel Nathaniel (Birmingham).

STUART: John (Yorks).

SWAN: James Alfred (Birmingham).

TAYLOR: Thomas Lumsden (Glasgow).

AS ASSOCIATES (20).

ABERCROMBIE: Leslie Patrick, M.A. Liverpool [S. 1900] (Liverpool).

BARROW: Thomas Henry [S. 1908].

BASTA: Habib, A.M.Inst.C.E., A.M.I.Mech.E. [*Special Examination*].

BHOWNAGGREE: Naserwanji Mancherji Merwanji [S. 1911].

BOTHWELL: Edwin Forbes [S. 1911] (Hong Kong).

CARMICHAEL: David Arthur [S. 1914] (Greenock).

DAVISON: William Robert [S. 1910] (Morpeth).

FRANCIS: George Eric [S. 1912. *Ashpitel Prizeman* 1914].

GEORGE: Thomas [S. 1913] (Swindon).

GRIBBON: Blakeley Rinder [S. 1904] (Leeds).

JENKINS: Trevellyn Phillip [S. 1911] (Swansea).

JEPSON: Henry Norman [S. 1910].

MARTYN: Egerton Alwyn Lawer [S. 1912] (Redruth).

MEREDITH: Edward [S. 1912] (Newbridge-on-Wye).

OWEN: Albert Henry [S. 1909].

SOPER: Stanley George [S. 1912].

THOMPSON: James Osbert [S. 1912; *Distinction in Thesis*] (Sheffield).

TOONE: John Algernon Edmund [S. 1908] (Melbourne).

TRISCOTT: Harris Stephens [S. 1911].

WHITELEY: Charles Taylor, P.A.S.I. [S. 1907] (Bradford).

The Secretary announced that at the Meeting of the Council held that afternoon it had been decided to delete the names of alien enemy members from the R.I.B.A. KALENDAR.

The Hon. Secretary announced the presentation of a number of books to the Library, and a cordial vote of thanks was passed to the donors.

The proceedings closed and the Meeting separated at 8.35 p.m.



ge  
he

n,  
ad

rs  
ad  
r-  
s,  
ss  
on

d  
(-  
l.  
y

7]

e  
y.

]

-  
.

l